

Zealand, Great Britain, and China. They applauded the evidence of political development in the islands since their last visit in 1961. They spoke of the political freedom that prevails and especially of the amicable relations between the American administration and the islanders. They stressed that besides political progress there have been great cultural and economic advances accomplished.

Such reports are not common in the United Nations where debates about trust or colonial territories evoke the familiar charges of exploitation. The strongest impression carried away by the mission was a new sense of unity among the island people. The mission's report emphasized that this was no small achievement in a trust territory consisting of 2,000 islands scattered across 3 million square miles of ocean.

The political development of the islands has been so successful as to make possible elections and the establishment of a Micronesian parliamentary government. This is being accomplished by this week's free election of members of both houses of the legislature.

Mr. President, a few years ago our Government was experimenting on one of the islands of Micronesia, Eniwetok, with a great force unleashed in very recent times. This was the atomic bomb. I suggest that the new force being unleashed in Micronesia in the form of political self-government will in the long run prove to be even more important and revolutionary. I am pleased to be able to bring to the people of the United States this good news of another great forward step in man's progress.

And it is heartening that that great step forward has taken place under U.S. guidance, U.S. sponsorship, U.S. leadership. Thus, westward not the course of empire but of democracy takes its way.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Tuesday next, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Tuesday, January 26, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22, 1965:

Adm. James S. Russell, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. John S. Thach, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William Diakiw, St. Joseph's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Sharon, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O God, beneath whose guiding hand our forefathers crossed the sea, we, their beneficiaries, this day bow our heads before Thy Majesty: gratefully, humbly, and reverently.

Father, we ask Thee to bless our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, the members of his Cabinet, the Senate, and this deliberative body, the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

Remember in Thy kingdom, O Lord, the great humanitarian and statesman, Sir Winston Churchill, one of the creators of the Atlantic Charter, which extended the four freedoms to all peoples and nations. May his soul repose among the just and his memory be eternal.

We thank Thee for favoring this grand land of ours with great men who loved Thee. They understood Thy truth that men are endowed "with certain unalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness."

We, who believe these rights are for all men, in commemorating the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, raise our prayer in behalf of this long-suffering nation, which is denied freedom by godless imperialism. Hear the plea of the many other peoples who continue to aspire to freedom, despite the brutal and ruthless suppression of this most despotic ideology and regime the world has ever known.

Ukrainian independence, proclaimed in a mute, self-centered world, became the first sacrifice to the satanic powers of communism. Continuous destruction of millions; the suffering of men, women, and children, constantly testify to the fact that Ukraine is still enslaved but not defeated. Merciful Lord, we humbly entreat Thee, do not permit this persistent struggle for liberty of the Ukrainian nation to go by the wayside unnoticed. Please awaken all freemen to their duty to suppress this growing evil over other innocent souls in the world.

Permit us, O gracious Lord, to bow our heads in solemn tribute to the countless defenders of freedom throughout the world. Many of these heroes have made the supreme sacrifice so that the torch of liberty may constantly proclaim the message of hope to all who are held in bondage.

Father, grant that the Ukrainian, and all other captive nations, may soon receive a new birth of freedom; that they may take their rightful place among the free nations of the world; we pray and beseech Thee through Jesus Christ, our Lord, Thy Son, who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 21, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of business and all special orders heretofore entered into for today, I may address the House for 1 hour, in order that I may yield to Members on the subject of the life and service of Sir Winston Churchill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL PANEL MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS ON JANUARY 26 AND 27

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics be allowed to sit on January 26 and 27 for its annual panel meeting of scientists while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL PANEL MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS ON JANUARY 26 AND 27

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Science and Astronautics and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I am pleased to extend an invitation to attend a briefing by the Administrator, Mr. James E. Webb, and other senior NASA headquarters officials on the agency's space program.

Other NASA officials participating will include Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director, Marshall Space Flight Center; Dr. William H. Pickering, Director, Jet Propulsion Laboratory; and Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper.

The briefing will take place in the caucus room No. 362, Cannon House Office Building, at 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 28.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has taken this means of trying to give Members of the House an opportunity to meet the men and

women who administer this great institution and to talk to them and so see for themselves the work they are doing. I urge those of you who can to attend the meetings.

TRIBUTE TO ED LARSON

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, all of Florida was shocked and saddened yesterday when it was learned that one of this Nation's truly great leaders had come to the end of his journey. I speak of our beloved State treasurer, J. Edwin Larson, one of the titans in Florida's history.

Death came suddenly and unexpectedly to this outstanding Floridian on Sunday, and with his passing, a chapter was closed which will forever serve as an inspiration for all men everywhere.

Florida has a unique cabinet system of government, the Governor serving as chairman of the cabinet and each of the six members of the cabinet having virtually an equal share in the affairs of our State.

We have had many fine men to serve in Florida's cabinet, but I can say without reservation that none have made any greater contribution than my friend, Ed Larson.

He was Florida's 16th treasurer, having taken office in January of 1941, and had just been sworn into his 7th consecutive term at the time of his passing. Born on June 27, 1900 at Brookston, Pa., he was educated at Allegheny College—A.B., and the University of Florida—LL. B. He served as principal of Keystone Heights High School and as mayor of Keystone Heights. Later he served as a county commissioner of Clay County, and was a member of the Florida House of Representatives from that county in 1929 and 1931. He served as a member of the Florida Senate in 1933 and served as collector of internal revenue for Florida 1933-39.

In his distinguished career he served as president of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers and Treasurers; and National Association of Securities Administrators.

His record of service to the Masons in Florida is without parallel, serving as grand master of Masons in Florida and as grand patron of the Order of the Eastern Star. He was the recipient of the highest honor which the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry can confer, that of the 33d degree. He was a member of the Red Cross of Constantine and the Shrine.

Married to the former Clara Bussard of Keystone Heights, they have three lovely daughters. He was a member of the Methodist Church.

The devotion with which he served the people of Florida in a period when Florida became the fastest growing in the Southeast, is a record of service which

can never be forgotten. His interests were wide and farflung, he always looked to the future.

Because of his vision and devotion, our State met the challenges which unprecedented growth brought. Great times call for great men, and surely J. Edwin Larson was a great man in a great time. He leaves a sorrowing State, a host of grieving friends, who were richly rewarded in having known him.

At the close of his journey, it can truly be said, here was a man among men, who left the world as a much better place in which to live, because of his efforts.

AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, I called attention to an Associated Press story, announcing action of the Labor Department in setting up a \$1.25 an hour minimum wage for youths who are to be employed in the Neighborhood Youth Corps projects under President Johnson's program to combat poverty.

Since then, I have heard from Art Wallhausen, Jr., president of the Mississippi County, Mo., Economic Opportunity Corp., protesting this action, and providing me with a copy of a letter he has written to President Johnson, setting forth the need for a modification of this order. I know, Mr. Speaker that there are many communities throughout this Nation, particularly in the rural areas, where the decision to require payment of the \$1.25 minimum wage to nonskilled trainees, will have the effect of curtailing and in some instances actually preventing the programs to be put into effect.

Because the letter addressed to the President, written by Mr. Wallhausen, editor of one of the leading weekly newspapers in Missouri, who has been giving so generously of his time and talents, sets forth so clearly and succinctly how the Labor Department ruling does not follow the spirit and letter of Public Law 88-452, I have requested permission to make this letter a part of my remarks, in the hope that other Members of this House who are similarly affected, will be encouraged to join with me in attempting to have the law administered as Congress intended that it should be. I think the letter which follows points out another good example where bureaucratic agencies of Government show their contempt for Congress by refusing to follow directives in the law.

JANUARY 21, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Judging by what we read in the newspapers concerning a top-level fight in the Department of Labor over whether or not to apply the \$1.25 minimum wage to work-trainees in the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, I believe you are the only court

of appeal in the matter, and I respectfully ask your assistance.

I am writing as president of the Mississippi County not-for-profit corporation which is developing a community action program under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The problem is this:

The school systems in this county have been preparing work-training programs under title I-B of the act, and yesterday, when the \$1.25 ruling was announced, had their paperwork ready to submit to the Labor Department. I understand no action has been taken in Washington on dozens of similar proposals, pending the Department ruling on wages.

Now, it appears, all these projects must be reworked, in most instances reducing the number of young people to be aided in order to raise the wage to \$1.25. In some instances the added cost to the school systems, many of which would have to raise the salaries of supervisors in order to give them at least as high a wage as the trainees, would be so prohibitive that they are being forced to cancel plans for the work-training program.

Mr. President, the program is desperately needed here, where the dropout rate is the highest in the State of Missouri—36.7 percent of our 16- and 17-year-olds. However, as a former resident of the South, you must be familiar with the problems involved in trying to uplift a fourth of the population all at once. The problems are discouraging enough, without adding Government harassment to the list.

Recognizing that declared Government policy is a \$1.25 minimum wage, I believe it is also Government policy to fight poverty, and to admit that the fight will take a different shape in each geographical region of the Nation.

The arbitrary ruling that \$1.25 must be paid to work-trainees, when the going wage in the surrounding community is 75 cents an hour or less, is a violation of "appropriateness" as spelled out in the Economic Opportunity Act. It is also the ideal way to insure that your war on poverty is not put into effect in those very communities, like my own, which need it the most.

I realize, Mr. President, that the ruling has been thoroughly discussed, and that there is very likely no face saving way to reverse the decision. But perhaps a modification is in order.

It is bitterly disappointing to learn that the act, which wisely provides for the economic differences between the various regions and subregions of our Nation, is to be violated, apparently to appease the wrath of the president of the AFL-CIO and the Under Secretary of Labor, at the expense of the poor.

In urban areas, where the going wage rate is \$1.25 or higher for apprentice-type labor I am certain there will be no objection to the Department's ruling.

However, I urgently request that you take note of the enclosed excerpt from the act, and order the Department of Labor to reconsider its ruling as it is to apply to the rural South.

Respectfully,

ART L. WALLHAUSEN, JR.,
President, Mississippi County Economic Opportunity Corp.

EXCERPT FROM PUBLIC LAW 88-452, THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

TITLE I-B—WORK TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 113. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

(a) The Director is authorized to enter into agreements providing for the payment by him of part or all of the cost of a State or local program submitted hereunder if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

* * * * *

(5) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee;

THE CUTBACK OF VETERANS' FACILITIES

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the closing of 17 Veterans' Administration regional offices, 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries as announced by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on January 13, 1965. There are many places to eliminate waste, improve efficiency, and to save money, but this is not one of them. The best information I can gather convinces me these facilities are not surplus and therefore to me it boils down to a matter of keeping faith with our veterans.

Our World War I veterans are now old men. World War II veterans are middle aged or close to it. They, along with the young men who fought the Korean war for us and who fight the relatively minor, yet deadly, brush fire battles, are growing older. As they age, the injuries and infirmities of their military service are aggravated and more medical care as well as supporting administrative attention are required. If we are lucky enough and smart enough to prevent war the number of veterans needing the services offered by VA facilities will naturally decline. Then, of course, fewer facilities will be needed and cutbacks will be in order. But that time is still in the future.

I am impressed by the administration's efforts to eliminate waste and save taxpayers' money. I would be more impressed, however, if it were not apparent that more new programs and projects will be instituted rather than old ones eliminated. Our national debt is around the \$325 billion mark. Our annual budget is straining at the \$100 billion barrier. Our gold reserve is down to \$15.6 billion. If there was ever a time for economy and efficiency, that time is now. I have always supported such efforts and, in fact, initiated a few, myself. But veterans' facilities and services cannot be measured by the usual dollar and efficiency yardsticks. We owe it to our veterans to have whatever is necessary and to have it conveniently located. An aged and sick old soldier ought not to have to travel far to see a doctor. He ought not be made to go a long distance to see a counselor at a regional office. If he is hospitalized, he ought to be close enough to home for his friends and relatives to visit conveniently.

The Veterans' Administration says it will save about \$23 million per year as a result of closing these facilities, and that is a lot of money. But think of it in comparison with the war on poverty, for

example, which is a \$1 billion program the first year and projected to \$2 billion the second and on up the escalator to \$5 billion.

And think of foreign aid which, at best, even in the knowledge of its staunchest supporters, serves many dubious causes. This has consumed in the neighborhood of \$120 billion over the years—enough to carry a \$23 million veterans' program for more than 5,000 years. The \$3.4 billion asked this year would carry the veterans' facilities they want to close for 165 years.

Today the Federal Government is concerned more than ever with the personal problems of some segments of our population. The President in his state of the Union message mentioned programs for the elderly, education, the poor, research to conquer disease, and other humanitarian and social problems. These are not in the least incompatible with care and facilities for our Nation's honored veterans.

I ask that more study be given the decision to close veterans' facilities. It seems to me that the care of veterans might well be coordinated with the goals of the Great Society. Certainly if it were not for these veterans there would be no American society, great or otherwise.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY CHEATING SCANDAL, LIKE WEST POINT CHEATING SCANDAL BEFORE IT, SHOWS FOLLY OF PERMITTING SERVICE ACADEMIES TO PURSUE POLICIES OF ATHLETIC PROFESSIONALISM

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services I have been distressed, as I know other Members have, by reports of the uncovering of a new service academy cheating scandal at the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs. The facts that have already been announced with regard to the Air Force Academy scandal show that it bears many striking resemblances to the cheating scandal uncovered at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1951. In both cases a major portion of the varsity football squad was involved.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we faced up to the plain truth which both these unfortunate events have now made clear. The fact that three-quarters of the Air Force Academy football squad were involved in this latest scandal and that of 100 cadets involved some 30 were football players makes it perfectly apparent that there is more than a purely coincidental connection between athletics as they are practiced at the service academies and cheating on examinations. The latest cheating scandal at the Air Force Academy is obviously the result of the athletic professionalism which is still rampant in all three of our service academies.

In their desperate efforts to recruit top athletes to build teams capable of competing with private colleges that follow similar standards of athletic professionalism, our service academies have admitted students with marginal academic records and with little if any real motivation for a service career. Inevitably under the pressures of the academy schedule, many of these individuals find that cheating is the only possible way they can continue their athletic careers at taxpayers' expense.

Whatever may be said for it in private colleges and universities, athletic professionalism, has no proper place in our service academies where college educations are provided at taxpayers' expense. The mission of these academies is solely to train career military leaders for the future, not to develop championship football teams or championship football players. Already criticism has been heard about whether the curriculums in our service academies are really adequate to the development of the kind of leaders we need in today's increasingly complex and technical military world. Developing championship football teams is certainly no requirement for building successful service careers. The lesson the so-called ivy league colleges learned many years ago is one our service academies ought to start learning now.

Mr. Speaker, I have called on Secretary McNamara to take steps without delay to put an end to athletic professionalism in these academies. I hope we may look for the same kind of prompt and vigorous action from the Secretary in this regard that we have seen demonstrated in connection with other matters. Some 3 years ago I brought to the attention of Members of the House, as well as to the attention of the Secretary of Defense, a documented case of improper, illegal, and dishonest methods followed in the recruiting of athletes for West Point. And I commented at the time on the effect which such procedures would be bound to have on cadets who are later required to subscribe to an honor system. Members who desire to examine the details of this case will find the facts set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 10, pages 13169-13171. So far as I have been able to determine no one was ever disciplined as a result of these disclosures, and frankly I have seen little change in the recruiting procedures followed by the athletic staffs of our service academies as a result of this information which I brought to the attention of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, it is time now I believe for the Secretary of Defense to address himself to this aspect of military education, and to get rid, once and for all, of these procedures which not only have no proper place in the mission of our service academies and which seriously impair their effectiveness, as the latest developments at Colorado Springs are now demonstrating. Let me add, Mr. Speaker, we need a thorough housecleaning to do this job, not just some new kind of TV spectacular put on by public relations experts to cover it up.

THE INCREASING NUMBER OF CASES OF CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the increasing number of cases of child abuse or neglect is a serious problem in the District of Columbia. It has been estimated eight District children die each year because of abusive treatment or neglect on the part of their parents or persons responsible for their care. Many others are seriously injured.

To provide these children more protection my bill introduced today would require District of Columbia physicians to report suspected cases of child beating immediately to the Metropolitan Police Department. The bill gives these physicians immunity from lawsuits which might result from these reports.

Maryland already has such a law, but in Washington, too many children are treated for injuries inflicted upon them by irresponsible parents or guardians and then returned to homes where they are again mistreated and sometimes even beaten to death with no community efforts made to correct the situation. We have a responsibility to give these helpless children more protection.

THE UNITED NATIONS IS NEEDED IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a speech on South Vietnam in Washington, Mo., over the weekend, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs William P. Bundy observed that "there may emerge possibilities for a U.N. role."

As one who has long urged a U.N. presence in South Vietnam, I am encouraged by this expression from an able and authoritative spokesman for the State Department. The options generally said to be available to us are the three unattractive ones of enlarging the war, precipitate withdrawal, and muddling along as we have been. Involving the United Nations is a constructive fourth alternative that we should do our best to bring about.

The jurisdiction of the U.N. in South Vietnam seems clear. What is happening there is a threat to world peace because the Vietnamese civil war is complicated by the involvement of outside powers. A U.N. presence could be invoked by the Governments of South Vietnam and the United States, as well as by others. If the U.N. Security Council failed to act, jurisdiction would devolve on the Gen-

eral Assembly under the uniting for peace procedure.

A U.N. presence in South Vietnam could help to stabilize the area. Action by South Vietnamese troops would rest on a firmer psychological foundation if their sponsor were the United Nations, rather than a fragile local government or a far-off United States. With peace restored, there would be an opportunity for negotiating the independence and neutrality of South Vietnam under circumstances which would guard against this being a cover for a Communist takeover.

Mr. Bundy cites two difficulties in the way of a U.N. presence in South Vietnam. First, as he points out, the U.N. involvement in the Congo was less than wholly effective. But from 1961 to their departure in 1964, United Nations troops did damp down a threat to world peace in the Congo. A U.N. operation in South Vietnam would be expensive, but it would be a tiny fraction of the more than \$2 million a day which the United States alone is now spending in South Vietnam.

A second difficulty pointed out by Mr. Bundy is the doubt concerning a U.N. role expressed by the United Nations Secretary General U Thant. It is true that Mr. Thant has blown hot and cold on the idea of invoking the U.N. in the South Vietnam situation. Last July 8 he called for a U.N. peacekeeping mission to supervise a neutralization plan for South Vietnam. On August 6 Mr. Thant doubted that the U.N. could "be usefully involved in any settlement of the crisis in southeast Asia." If we and other leading members of the U.N. are willing to work hard for a U.N. presence in South Vietnam, I am confident the Secretary General would go along.

Most important of all, I am sure that the American people would go along. At dozens of meetings and on hundreds of doorsteps in my Wisconsin district in the last few months, I have received the warmest support for the idea that we invoke the moral authority of the U.N. to internationalize the position in South Vietnam.

REMOVING THE GOLD COVER IS NEEDED TO CONSERVE OUR WORLD ECONOMIC POSITION

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it has long since become apparent that the statutory gold cover requirements not only serves no practical purpose but hamstrings the U.S. performance of its world economic role. There follows my recent statement on the subject, a Washington Post article of January 25 giving the views of the Committee for Economic Development, an editorial from the Washington Post of January 11, and an editorial from the New York Times of January 25.

REUSS STATEMENT FOR REPEAL OF GOLD COVER ON FEDERAL RESERVE DEPOSITS AND NOTES, JANUARY 7, 1965

The bill which I am submitting today, H.R. 2084, would repeal the 25 percent gold reserve requirement for Federal Reserve notes and deposits.

The gold cover is as useless to the body politic as the vermiform appendix is to the body physical of men. The domestic value of the dollar is completely unrelated to the amount of gold held by the Government. The strength of the dollar depends on maintaining a sound and strong economy. Today, money is created by the Federal Reserve to supply the needs of the economy—enough to keep it growing but not so much that inflation occurs. Money is not created simply because gold is owned by the Government. The present requirement for a 25 percent gold cover is, therefore, an anachronism—left over from days when people had not grown up to the realities of the modern money and banking system.

Useless as the gold cover requirement is in assuring the domestic value of the dollar, its existence is harmful in a number of ways.

First, while money is created by the Fed according to standards which have nothing to do with the gold supply, the arbitrary requirement that there must be a 25 percent gold cover will sooner or later make it impossible for the Fed to keep on adding to the money supply as the economy grows.

The gold supply today comes to \$15.5 billion. Since the Fed's notes and deposit liabilities come to around \$55 billion, \$13.7 billion of the gold is the amount of cover needed today. This leaves only \$1.8 billion as the 25 percent base against which new money can be created. When the Fed bumps up against this ceiling—and, at present rates of expansion in the money supply, this could be within 2 years—it would have to stop creating money. The economy would grind to a halt, and we would have a manmade depression on our hands.

Second, the existence of the gold cover for our domestic money leads uninformed foreigners to think that our entire gold supply is not available as backing for our dollar obligations abroad. This is not true. All of the \$15.5 billion is, in fact, available to foreign official holders of dollars—central banks and governments—as backing for those dollars. A special provision of the Federal Reserve Act makes this possible. These facts are well known to official holders of claims, which now total around \$13.5 billion. And the likelihood that these claims would all be presented against our gold is very slight.

However, the fact that our domestic gold cover requirements now apparently leaves only \$1.8 billion as "free gold" can be used to arouse fears among those less informed. These fears can in turn be mobilized to exert undesirable pressures on the United States. The fearmongers and blackmailers are not scrupulous even with their figures. They frequently make it appear that against \$1.8 billion in "free gold," international claims against our gold come to over \$29 billion. This huge figure includes about \$15.6 billion held by foreign private individuals, banks, nonofficial institutions—none of whom can directly purchase gold from the United States and nearly all of whom hold these dollars to pay for current transactions in this country.

There is no reason to expose ourselves to this kind of misunderstanding and threat of blackmail. We should, by repealing the useless 25 percent domestic gold cover, make it crystal clear that the whole of our \$15.5 billion gold supply is available against official international claims.

Third, with all doubts removed on the availability of our gold for settling our in-

ternational accounts, we could do what we should have been doing.

We could tell France that we prefer to get back all the \$1 billion in dollars now in French monetary reserves in exchange for gold. Having given up its \$1 billion in claims, it would lose its present ability to place pressures on this country or to cash in the claim at a time when it would be most embarrassing for the United States.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Jan. 25, 1965]

GOLD COVER REMOVAL IS BACKED: ECONOMISTS FAVOR U.S. PLAN TO MEET CLAIMS ON DOLLAR

(By Frank C. Porter)

Administration plans to remove the 25 percent gold cover on commercial bank deposits with the Federal Reserve System won strong backing yesterday from the influential Committee for Economic Development.

But the CED would go even further. It would also free the gold backing for Federal Reserve currency.

The committee is a nonprofit economic research organization that generally reflects the views of the more liberal wing of American big business. Two years ago its active support of President Kennedy's plan to slash income taxes helped crystallize corporate opinion in favor of the program.

ARGUMENT OF 1961 RECALLED

Yesterday's statement was issued by Frazer B. Wilde, CED chairman and board chairman of Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. He recalled that the CED called for abolition of the gold cover requirement 4 years ago and said its 1961 argument is even more valid today than it was then.

"There should be no doubt as to the availability of the total U.S. gold stock to meet international claims," he said.

The requirement was enacted as part of the Federal Reserve Act in 1913 at a time when Americans could exchange currency for gold. In its present form, it directs the Federal Reserve banks to maintain a supply of gold equal to 25 percent of their notes and deposit liabilities.

This required gold backing for notes and deposits now amounts to \$13.5 billion.

GOLD SUPPLY DWINDLES

But the Nation's total gold supply has dwindled from a 1949 peak of \$25 billion to just a bit over \$15 billion.

This leaves a bare \$1.5 billion in free gold with which to meet some \$28 billion in international claims against the dollar.

There is little likelihood that foreign central banks would simultaneously rush to convert all these claims into U.S. gold. Until recently, in fact, confidence in the dollar had been so strong that the gold outflow was stemmed throughout most of 1964.

In the past few months, however, the crisis in the British pound and a steep rise in the U.S. deficit of international payments to an estimated annual rate of \$5 billion in the fourth quarter has put the dollar under new pressure. France, which has been converting its dollar surpluses into American gold at a \$400 million annual clip, announced earlier this month that it will step up its rate of conversion. And just last week the U.S. gold supply reached its lowest level since 1939.

The United States has pledged its entire gold supply, not just the \$1.5 billion in free gold, to meet international claims. The law permits it to suspend the 25-percent domestic gold cover in an emergency.

But this fact is dimly understood in European capitals. To remove any lingering foreign doubts about the dollar's soundness and to permit the domestic money supply to grow with the economy, the Treasury announced recently it would seek legislation to remove the gold cover on Federal Reserve deposits. This would free nearly \$5 billion more in gold.

The Treasury would keep the cover on currency, however, presumably to satisfy critics who contend the cover is necessary for monetary discipline and to avoid inflation. These critics caused Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon to rescind a proposal to abolish the cover 3 years ago.

But opponents of the cover, such as the CED, insist it has been an anachronism ever since the rights of Americans to convert currency to gold was eliminated 30 years ago. The gold exchange standard inaugurated then limited the use of gold to the settlement of international accounts, they argue, and it is to this purpose that the whole gold supply should be dedicated.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Jan. 11, 1965]

AURI SACRA FAMES

It would be too much to hope that the gold reserve requirement against the domestic liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks can be lifted without a rash of frightening rumors from the lips of those who are ignorant about monetary matters and the informed few who have a direct interest in perpetuating a hag-ridden myth. But the facts of the matter are available for all who are willing to ponder them with an open mind.

Under the present law the 12 Federal Reserve banks are required to maintain a 25 percent gold cover against their bank-note and deposit liabilities. The bank notes—paper currency of all denominations—now amount to about \$34.5 billion. Deposit liabilities consist of the reserves of the private member banks, amounting to \$18.5 billion, and the deposits of the U.S. Treasury and official foreign institutions, altogether a total of \$19.5 billion.

Why is there a gold cover? The briefest answer is that it is a quaint relic of a bygone era. Before 1934, when the holders of Federal Reserve notes could freely exchange them for gold coins, a gold cover requirement was a necessity. But with inconvertible paper currencies the gold requirement, as Representative HENRY S. REUSS remarked, "is as useless to the body politic as the vermiform appendix is to the body physical of men."

A failure to alter the gold-cover provisions of the law could lead to insufferable consequences. With the gold ratio at 27.6 percent, misinformed foreign holders of dollar claims may believe that the U.S. gold supply is not available to meet international obligations. And with only \$1.5 billion in gold over and above the statutory requirement, the Federal Reserve System has little room to create the money required to keep a \$630 billion economy growing. The only alternative would be a lowering of the reserve balances that the private banks must maintain at the Federal Reserve banks, but that solution might make monetary control far more difficult.

Auri sacra fames—the accursed craving for gold—has been a harbinger of misery since the dawn of civilization. But it needn't be if men will only act sensibly. The United States is one of three countries—the other two are very small—that still maintain a gold reserve against the domestic liabilities of their central banks. In dealing with the gold-cover appendix, as in surgery, there is greater safety in complete excision than in a partial operation. Representative REUSS' bill for total repeal of the gold cover deserves the wholehearted support of the administration.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1965]
PROPOSALS ON GOLD

The proposal to eliminate the domestic gold cover so that the Nation's gold stock will be freely available to meet the demands of foreign creditors has met the objection that the gold cover is essential as a check against excessive monetary expansion.

But if the domestic gold cover remains at the present legal minimum of 25 percent the monetary authorities will be made to increase the money supply to meet the legitimate demands of a growing economy. If the gold lobby prevails, there is little doubt that foreign demand will increase, lowering the gold stock to the minimal 25-percent level.

A compromise solution suggested by C. E. Walker, of the American Bankers Association, calls for reducing rather than eliminating the gold cover. Mr. Walker admits that a change must be made to permit a necessary increase in the domestic money supply and to reassure foreign creditors. But he fears that removing the cover entirely would lead to a relaxation in the administration's efforts to defend the dollar.

Mr. Walker's proposal for keeping a small link to gold is more likely to induce complacency than do away with it. The gold cover has been reduced in the past without instilling a need for discipline; if it is reduced again, the natural tendency will be to sit back and relax until the gold stock erodes to whatever new minimum is set. But with no cover at all, the administration will be forced to step up its disciplinary measures to safeguard currency strength.

The idea that nothing should be done about removing the cover until new steps are taken to reduce the deficit also is a mistake. For it would create fresh doubts in Europe and, at the same time, provoke concern about the adequacy of the domestic monetary supply. The administration can best allay fears by combining a request to eliminate the gold cover with a series of other measures designed to reduce the dollar drain and the pressure on the gold stock.

I wish I could say, Mr. Speaker, that the reaction to the proposal to remove the gold cover has been uniformly favorable. In the interest of fairness, I wish to include some negative comments I have recently received:

ANNA MARIA, FLA.,
January 25, 1965.

Congressman HENRY REUSS,
Washington, D.C.:

Your administration fronting for retirement dollar devaluation outrageous act of calumny, stupidity, stealthy inflation.

EDWARD AND EMMA CHANDLER.

SPRINGFIELD, MO.,
January 19, 1965.

Congressman HENRY S. REUSS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: While I'm away from my beloved State of Wisconsin I hear you are playing the fool's part in fronting for the White House by introducing a bill to repeal the 25-percent support behind our dollar.

Have you lost your brains? What kind of American are you? This is insanity of the first order. Do you have a sound explanation?

Please let me hear from you.

E. R. BELL.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 14, 1965.

Representative HENRY S. REUSS.

SIR: If what Henry J. Taylor of the New York World-Telegram and Sun says about you in the enclosed article is true, how dare you, sir, to introduce such legislation as the outright repeal of our dollar's gold support?

Yours truly,

Mrs. MARIE L. GREER.

BLUFFTON, S.C.,
January 18, 1965.

MY DEAR MR. REUSS: I did not think any man intelligent enough to be elected to Congress would ever introduce legislation to sabotage American money.

My husband and I spent 3 years in Europe in the early thirties. Had you heard the

stories we got from Germans about their iniquitous inflation and from Frenchmen who were robbed by their government of practically everything for which they had worked for lifetimes to accumulate.

To destroy the value of your money is sheer, brazen, criminal theft on the part of any government. Of course a government lessens its debt by the amount of the inflation. But it does it at the expense of the people from whom its money comes.

A German woman in Taormina told me her husband was on the street when German inflation reached its peak trying to buy something for what remained of his capital. The mark was catapulting so rapidly he went into a shop and bought a saddle in the window. She said he had never owned a saddle. He had never even owned a horse.

Lyndon Johnson is not God. Neither was Mr. Kennedy to whom money was something that appeared out of the blue when he wanted it. No one can prevent what happened to Germans and Frenchmen at the hands of their criminally dishonest governments if this country makes money just some scraps of paper run off of a press and that you carry in a wheelbarrow when you go shopping.

What, in the name of God, induced you to introduce such destructive legislation? This administration had better awake to the cold, hard truth that governments and people are alike. Both must live within their honest budgets * * * not incur debts they cannot pay * * * not live beyond their means.

It's merely a point of honor and integrity and the highest principles. Not to mention morals.

It is just as simple as that.

Sincerely,

EDITH DICKEY MOSES.

LA MESA, CALIF.,

January 22, 1965.

DEAR MR. REUSS: It is with much regret that I see you are advocating that the gold backing of our dollar be discontinued. It is a long, long step backwards.

Devaluation of currency has been tried in many countries in the past, always with disastrous results. We are in our present unhappy state, regarding money, because of complete fiscal irresponsibility.

The piece of paper money in your hand—no matter the number on it—is worth nothing, of course, without its gold backing. This is what you are asking for.

You may speak of our great country with its natural resources, manpower, and know-how. Who will work without good money in their hands with which to buy food, rent, etc.? Just plain, hard cash, gold-backed, is essential to our good standard of living.

Now we do not have sufficient gold reserves to pay for calls for our gold, or even stability for our own dollars. How appalling that you should suggest that we no longer keep the 25-percent gold backing for our own currency.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELIZABETH D. LOWE.

INDIANA RESERVOIR PROJECTS ARE CAPITAL ASSETS

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the introduction today of the proposed Federal budget for 1966 marks the annual opening of the Pandora's box of criticism.

Some of it is constructive, some of it destructive, a great deal of it fails to take into consideration all of the facts behind the individual requests.

We are certain to hear throughout the debate ahead that the Government fails to apply business principles in the implementation of the various budget requests. Invariably those who express this specific type of criticism tend to overlook one particular business principle which is always considered in many of the programs and projects advanced for consideration each year.

I am referring to those expenditures which add materially to the wealth and growth of our Nation. Funds expended by an industry to add a new production facility or to expand present facilities are regarded as an investment in the future. They result in an increase in the company's capital assets.

But when the Government spends money for the construction of reservoirs the critics overlook or fail to recognize the returns to be gained through this investment in the future.

The proposed budget for 1966 contains appropriation requests to continue construction of three major reservoir projects in my section of Indiana. Two of these projects will be virtually completed within the next fiscal year. The third will be completed in another 2 years. Upon completion these will represent a total expenditure of more than \$60 million.

What is going to be the return on this investment? Basically these funds have been spent for flood control purposes. Going back through the years we find the average annual damage resulting from floods in the area below these projects running into several million dollars. When these projects are completed they will reduce this by \$3 million each year. Thus within 20 years' time the reduction of flood damage will amount to the entire cost of these projects.

At the same time the impounded waters will create a new recreation industry which will add substantially to the area's economy.

These projects and many more like them are truly capital assets.

AN ADMINISTRATION OF EXCELLENCE FOR WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, January 18, on the steps of West Virginia's State Capitol, the 27th Governor of the State of West Virginia, Hulett C. Smith, delivered a brilliant inaugural address. He set the tone of his new administration by pledging for West Virginia a new era of excellence in all fields.

With a firm mandate from the people of West Virginia based on the largest electoral majority won by any Governor since 1948, Governor Smith showed his

determination to provide the spark of leadership necessary to ignite the State to a vast new cooperative effort. The snow-covered crowd in front of the capitol cheered when Governor Smith stated:

First, I am determined that excellence in education will be our No. 1 goal. A great educational system is a prerequisite to a great State.

On the following day, Tuesday, January 19, immediately prior to flying to Washington for President Johnson's inauguration, Governor Smith delivered his first legislative message to a joint session of the West Virginia Senate and House of Delegates. Taken together, these two noble pronouncements set the future goals for West Virginia and spelled out in clear-cut fashion the pathway toward those goals.

Mr. Speaker, Gov. Hulett Smith is no stranger to government. He has been instilled with the instincts of sound public service. His father, the late Honorable Joe L. Smith, served in this body for eight consecutive terms from 1929 through 1944. He himself has been State chairman of the Democratic executive committee, and has more recently served as the West Virginia commissioner of commerce during a period when he helped engineer an unprecedented expansion of industry and rise in employment in the State.

With great pride, I ask my colleagues to review these great State papers of West Virginia's Governor Smith:

[From the Charleston Gazette, Jan. 19, 1965]
A PLEDGE TO EXCELLENCE—TEXT OF SMITH'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

My fellow West Virginians, I step forward today to accept this opportunity to serve West Virginia and all its people—with confidence, and with determination—knowing that today, we begin an era of a new spirit in West Virginia.

Though humbled by the honor you have given me, I am at the same time eager to meet the challenges which face West Virginia.

Indebted to all my friends, I have a keen awareness that more than my efforts alone brought me to this day.

I am grateful to my teachers, whose counsel guided me; thankful to my parents, whose example, sacrifices, and training in a Christian home inspired me, and will strengthen me in the times ahead; and for my wife and children, whose patience, encouragement, and love sustain me.

My fellow citizens, we meet today to set the goals of a new administration—to build on the proud achievements of the past and to plan anew for the future.

It is a time to reaffirm those qualities which unite us, and to purge those elements which divide us.

We must set standards for our government's conduct, and search for a new spirit to unite us all, as true sons and daughters of this proud State.

I have pledged that I would give this State an administration of excellence, an administration which will demand the highest standards of ethics, integrity, and honesty from dedicated and qualified public servants and never tolerate incompetence or mediocrity.

Today, as your Governor, I am proud to reaffirm that pledge of excellence.

With excellence as our standard, let us determine our goals not just for 1 year, nor just for 4 years, but for all the years that lie ahead.

These plans must be both objective and visionary; both prudent and imaginative.

First, I am determined that excellence in education will be our No. 1 goal. A great educational system is a prerequisite to a great State.

We must improve our schools, so that every child will have the best possible teacher, and every teacher the best possible salary and classroom.

Educational excellence must extend from our grade schools through our colleges and universities.

We must expand our adult education program. In this manner, every citizen will have the opportunity for a continuing education.

It has been said, "there is a time for quality and a time for quantity." Today, education in West Virginia is in need of both.

The pursuit of excellence must also be extended to the road programs of West Virginia.

Through careful use of highway funds, and through systematic planning, we can accelerate the building of the road system which West Virginia has long needed, and which is now within our reach.

We must give high priority to roads which provide service to our more inaccessible communities, our industries and our farms, so they can have full and general access to marketplaces of the State and the Nation.

We must continue to expand our interstate and primary system, so that we can truly unite all sections of our State, and our State with the Nation.

The pursuit of excellence will carry into industry and commerce. We today are citizens of an opportunity State. We must explore all means to attract new industry and to encourage our existing industries to expand. This will mean more jobs for thousands of West Virginians.

This new spirit of excellence demands that we develop our tourist potential into a major industry for this State.

Nature has blessed West Virginia with great beauty. Now we must develop our scenic grandeur so that it will become a haven for the vacationer and the industrialist alike. And we must tell the world what we have to offer in West Virginia—and this, too, shall be done.

This new spirit of excellence will thrive only if there is an open-door policy between the State government and the people. I believe that the surest guarantee of responsible government is an informed public.

And this new spirit must be compassionate, compassionate for those who are in need in this State.

Together, then, we can build a State where self-reliant and intelligent citizens, united in progressive communities and rising above the petty prejudices of color, religion, and race, will create a society where decency and dignity will prevail.

To achieve these goals, I need your assistance and dedication.

The call to greatness is sounding for us today.

You and I—public servant and private citizen alike—have a responsibility to pursue the course of excellence, to work together, and to develop our State to its full potential.

Instilled with this unity of purpose, and steadfast in our desire to improve all areas of community life; vitally concerned with the welfare of all citizens of today and tomorrow; we can travel on that high road of excellence.

My fellow citizens, let us resolve today to instill this new spirit of excellence in our hearts and minds and lives, so that future generations might proudly boast of this great hour in our State's history.

Inspired by such resolution, and aware of our responsibilities to the future, we shall leave a heritage that will be a challenge to succeeding generations.

Let no West Virginian be mistaken. These goals of excellence will not easily be achieved.

But you and I must constantly strive to make West Virginia first in the constellation of the 50 States.

We have a solid foundation upon which to build, a foundation left to us by Governor Barron.

We are fortunate that he has been a forward-looking chief executive, who possessed the vision to create programs of progress, and the courage to seek unconventional answers to unprecedented problems.

It is our responsibility, therefore, to carry forward these programs with action, and to propose new legislation to meet the needs of the future.

Tomorrow, I will go before the legislature.

I will ask members of that distinguished body to join with me in creating new programs for better schools, more and better highways, for a more efficient and streamlined State government and such other legislative programs which are necessary steps toward achieving our goal of excellence in government.

There are many fields of promise waiting to be harvested in West Virginia.

Let us reap that bountiful harvest.

We stand today at that blessed moment of beginning again, when no achievement of the past appears quite good enough, and no prospect of the future seems impossible.

We recognize that in the Mountain State, we have mountains to climb and obstacles to overcome, as we move toward our goals.

But we have pinnacles to reach and we shall reach them.

And so, my fellow West Virginians, let us pursue the goal of excellence. Let us seek the new spirit in West Virginia. Let us seek new ways to advance the common good. And let us prayerfully and humbly ask guidance from a benevolent God who has so richly endowed our State.

For my part, I do not ask that the burdens of this great office be lightened, but that my back may be strengthened to bear them.

In such a spirit, and with such goals, we can achieve a greatness worthy of this State and of its people.

I pray to Almighty God that I be given the light to perform my duties with courage, wisdom, and compassion.

With this prayer, I welcome the challenges and burdens; the tasks and the responsibilities of this office.

[From the Charleston Gazette, Jan. 20, 1965]

TEXT OF GOVERNOR SMITH'S ADDRESS TO LEGISLATURE

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislature:

We gather today in one of West Virginia's most important hours.

We are fortunate to be given the opportunity to serve our State in such an exciting time.

It is a truly gratifying experience, and a challenge.

Our determination to accomplish a State government of excellence is supported by a groundswell of favorable public opinion.

The work we do here—our every effort—must have the active support of all of our citizens.

Every man, woman, and child who becomes an active worker for the cause of a government of excellence, and wages an individual campaign persuading others to be the same, is a key asset in our pursuit of excellence.

Self-interest groups shape public opinion only when most of us fail to speak and act.

This new administration—this administration of the new spirit—is convinced that our people are now eager to speak and act for the better West Virginia.

We still have problems to solve.

But public initiative has come to the front in West Virginia.

The tide is running with us.

For each generation, progress is an individual, do-it-yourself project.

It is only on this basis—each citizen contributing his time and talents for the good of all—that we can reach our great goals.

In government, as in life, we get out of it what we put into it—no more, no less.

We must march to meet the future.

But we must march together—West Virginians all.

We must win acceptance of the West Virginia image for what it really is.

We can do this.

We can do it by working for excellence.

What other people think of us depends entirely on what we do.

With three consecutive all-time high economic records to the State's credit, we have much of which to be proud.

But we cannot afford to relax our efforts—not even for a minute—for the job of progress never ends.

I am extremely confident about West Virginia's future—a future which can be as bright as we want it to be, for the call to greatness has sounded for West Virginia.

And, this call is echoed in our new spirit.

Let it be our resolve here today that no longer are we going to treat symptoms of problems, but causes of problems—that we are going to show the Nation and the world what cooperative action can do.

We declare in favor of excellence.

But our actions will speak louder than our words.

So, let our actions be an unmistakable expression of the will of our people.

EDUCATION

Last March, I presented my policy statement on education for West Virginia. Throughout the primary and general campaigns, I continued to stress that policy, expressing the belief that the most important citizen living today is the 6-year-old child who will enter school next fall. That child—and those children in school today—as well as those to follow, are the future of our State and of this Nation.

I will not take your time to review the needs of our schools. Our low ranking in most educational categories is well known to a large majority of West Virginians. I do want to reiterate my determination to give education highest priority.

Proposed legislation includes bills to increase teacher salaries, establish programs for school building construction, educational television, and remedial reading.

The West Virginia Education Association, our school boards association, and our State department of education have offered a comprehensive school improvement program called Decision 65.

I have studied this program carefully. It has been revised where revision was felt necessary and I shall submit it for your consideration, because I believe it to be realistic. It meets some of our most pressing needs, and its cost is spread over a 3-year period.

An administration bill embraces these principles and it will be introduced today.

In its first year, the program calls for more than \$12 million in new money, including funds for the comprehensive plan, and totals approximately \$33 million for a 3-year period.

This will mean an average salary increase of more than \$1,300 during that period. These increases will materially help boards of education to keep qualified teachers in the classrooms—the teachers who are the very heart of any school system.

ROADS

Along with education, another problem of great urgency is roads.

My special task force on roads has suggested establishment of county committees to recommend criteria of need and priorities

for secondary road construction, maintenance and long-range planning.

The task force recommended that standards of design be developed for each functional classification of roads, and that classifications be made statutory. It is further recommended that an immediate study be made to provide adequate financing of our secondary road system.

It is proposed that proceeds from bonds issued under the better roads amendment of 1964 be placed in a separate account, and audited by a separate firm.

I ask approval of legislation for these road programs during the present session.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

The needless loss of lives on our highways, and the increasing number of accidents which cause serious injury to our people, points out the need for expansion and improvement of our State's traffic safety program.

We must take steps to protect the careful driver from the reckless driver. Expansion of the department of public safety, as provided in the budget bill, will be a big move in this direction.

To protect our young drivers, and others who travel our roads, we must establish a drivers' education program in every one of our secondary schools.

I also urge a probationary license for drivers between the ages of 16 and 18. Under such a plan, violations of any of the State's traffic vehicle control and movement laws would mean suspension of such a probationary license.

HEALTH

A matter of serious concern to health and law-enforcement authorities is the increased use of so-called "pep" pills by drivers of motor vehicles.

I propose legislation providing for control of both the sale and possession of such drugs, which, when used improperly, can result in the loss of lives.

The need for a good Samaritan law also exists in West Virginia.

Many automobile accident victims are reportedly denied first aid and emergency care because the threat of lawsuits looms over those persons who might render such care and services.

These situations arise from alleged malpractice, omissions, lack of continuity in care, and the like—despite the fact that these persons may have given emergency care only because they were at or near the scene of an accident, and despite the fact that they performed their services under the most adverse circumstances, and with the best of intentions.

Adequate protection should be given those who voluntarily render such help, solely on the basis of being a good Samaritan.

VITAL STATISTICS

West Virginia's present law on the registration of vital statistics is outmoded. The law is vague and sketchy. Certain provisions essential to a sound vital statistics act are either lacking or inadequate.

Improvements in this law should be made during the present session.

EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

The challenges we face today demand that we have a modern and efficient government. Therefore, I strongly recommend that we begin today the task of reorganizing the executive branch of State government, in order that we may serve the people of this State in the best and most efficient manner.

Specifically, initial steps should be taken to modernize our fiscal structure by streamlining operations in budgeting, accounting, auditing, and treasury management.

In addition, action should be taken to consolidate responsibilities in penal and corrective fields by establishing a division of

corrections within the department of public institutions.

CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION

The operation of our State government today is severely limited and often made more costly by provisions of a State constitution written 93 years ago.

Since 1872, when our constitution was fashioned, our people have seen fit to make a number of changes. A great many more are needed today; and still more undoubtedly would be necessary in the future.

In an effort to strengthen our governmental structure, I am recommending a constitutional convention, and I urge you to take appropriate legislative action to accomplish this purpose.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

We in State government have the responsibility of protecting the rights of the public, as well as the rights of those who serve the public.

I consider appropriate conflict-of-interest legislation an integral part of this administration, which has excellence as its goal. Such legislation, of course, must contain proper enforcement and penalty provisions.

A special task force has been appointed by your Governor to make recommendations on this matter. This task force has requested that you appoint a legislative committee to join in an investigation of this subject, and to give it further study before taking whatever action you deem appropriate.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

With an eye to the future and with a constant awareness of the need to alleviate all forms of poverty in this State, West Virginia has joined ambitiously with the Federal Government in order to benefit from the many programs available under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Many of our communities, as well as agencies in State government, have been very active in their participation under this program and, in the future, it will mean many more inroads in the war against poverty in West Virginia.

Legislation will be presented for your consideration to assure that we utilize all the advantages available to us under this act.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Protection of the West Virginia consumer against fraud has become a serious matter and deserves immediate attention. Far too often, the public is exploited through misrepresentations.

Some agencies of the State have regulatory powers in this particular field. However, the housewives and the shoppers of West Virginia often are victimized in areas not specifically covered by existing laws.

I hereby propose establishment of a division of consumer protection within the office of the attorney general. Legislation to accomplish this will soon be introduced.

This will authorize the attorney general to take whatever action is necessary—criminal or otherwise—against such fraudulent practices.

INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

Liberalization of laws relating to investment of State funds, with appropriate safeguards, would bring a substantial increase in income for West Virginia.

Under the present system, restrictions result in an interest yield to this State, which is considerably less than that of most other States.

West Virginia investments are earning approximately 1 percent less than those of neighboring States. This 1 percent on our investments of which I speak would have meant an additional \$2,750,000 income for this State in the last fiscal year.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

In the last 4 years, significant improvements have been made in our unemploy-

ment compensation laws. Both the fund level and the benefit schedule have been strengthened.

You will receive proposals soon for further improvements in this vital area of activity.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

A more realistic benefit schedule is needed in workmen's compensation.

In addition, other suggested changes would remove the limitation on the amount of medical expenses, and would make total temporary benefits no longer deductible from statutory permanent partial awards.

WAGES

The record economic progress West Virginia has experienced in the past 4 years has resulted in alltime high personal incomes for most West Virginians.

Yet many of our citizens have not shared in this prosperity for the simple reason that their wage rates are too low.

To help relieve this situation, there should be a maximum workweek, and a minimum wage of \$1 an hour.

In this same general field, fringe benefits should be included as wage costs in computing wages under the prevailing wage rate act.

You will also be asked to consider legislation which will guarantee equal pay for women who do the same work as men.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Action is needed to strengthen the authority and scope of service performed by the State commissioner of labor.

The commissioner should be authorized by statute to mediate disagreements between labor and management in areas currently exempt from Federal jurisdiction, and, when requested by both sides.

HOUSING

You will soon receive legislation designed to give the department of commerce authority to help resolve the problem of inadequate housing in West Virginia.

Under such legislation, the department's duty would be to cooperate with private builders, building craft unions, municipal and county governments, and Federal and State agencies. This would constitute a joint effort toward eliminating inadequate housing in this State.

CLEANUP AND BEAUTIFICATION

West Virginia's nationally recognized cleanup and beautification program certainly will be continued by the new administration.

The cleanup has been a grassroots movement from its beginning 4 years ago. Volunteers in all parts of the State have made the program an outstanding success.

I am sure that this effective interest and support by volunteers will be continued and increased.

This volunteer effort will be given further support by the department of commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

With further regard to the department of commerce, you will be asked to approve certain minor changes of a technical nature in the 1961 act that created the department.

It is suggested that you study the possibility of setting up a science and space unit within the department.

Such a unit would pool this State's efforts to meet the challenge of developing our scientific capabilities. It would also seek to obtain more space business for West Virginia industries. Above all, such an organization would formulate a policy aimed at strengthening development of all sciences in this State.

WOOD UTILIZATION

You may want to consider new action in the field of wood utilization.

Wood production has been increased substantially in recent years, and its use in manufacturing has grown rapidly since cre-

ation of the Governor's committee on wood utilization in 1961.

The wood utilization conference must be continued; research programs dealing with new wood products, plant management and related needs should be strengthened.

Each year, our West Virginia forests are plagued by forest fires, which result in a loss of much valuable timber.

This points up the need for a more vigorous plan of action in forest fire suppression, together with the need for necessary financing to carry out its objectives.

AGRICULTURE

The West Virginia poultry farmer deserves attention in your consideration of legislation to help agriculture.

There is a need for a new egg inspection law which would aid our farmers in competing on an equal basis with farmers of surrounding States. This will contribute to better poultry products for the State.

We also seek a uniform poultry feed law which would encourage expansion of the poultry industry.

The administration urges your approval of these bills.

WATER DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

I urge the repeal of the 1963 bill authorizing and setting forth the functions of the West Virginia Water Development Commission.

LAW OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

You will have before you proposals to update our law of criminal procedure, to bring it into compliance with recent decisions of Federal courts and the supreme court of West Virginia.

These proposals embrace revision of the law which deals with preliminary procedure, search and seizure, discovery, bail, guilty pleas, transcripts for indigents, and the right to counsel.

The bills represent a year's study and work by a special committee of the West Virginia State bar.

COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

Your attention is directed toward the financial problems of our counties and municipalities.

Our entire State will benefit from any action you take which would enable our counties and municipalities to provide the improvements which are now essential to our continued economic growth.

BUDGET

Our continued economic growth has made possible increases in the education program, as well as improvements in other services without any increase in taxes to meet the budget recommendations.

These improvements include: an appropriation which will permit us to hire additional State policemen, and which will give a much needed salary increase in the present personnel;

Salary increases for lower-paid personnel in State institutions and mental hospitals; Increased salaries and additional enforcement officers within the Department of Labor;

And the hiring of additional guards in our penal institutions.

Other legislation is still being considered which may be necessary or appropriate to recommend for your consideration later in this session.

CONCLUSION

Members of the legislature, I leave you now as one who seeks your help in meeting the challenges that lie ahead. We meet together in our present roles for the first time, yet I know that this initial meeting here today can only be the beginning of what will be an era of cooperation—an era of progress—an era of new ideas—and an era of decisive action for West Virginia.

This is the advent of a new administration whose chief measure of success will be

determined by what all of us, together, can accomplish. We each have responsibilities to the people of this great State. To each one of you I pledge that this administration will never fail to recognize its responsibility to you. I have asked the people of West Virginia to come with me on a journey, a journey in pursuit of excellence. Alone, I can accomplish but little. Together, you and I, as elected representatives of those we serve, can do much.

Our friendship with one another and our devotion to West Virginia can lead us to that exciting day when the proudest boast a man can make is this: "I am a West Virginian."

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, last evening with millions of other people here in this great country of ours, I listened to the CBS hour "Sir Winston Churchill—Man of the Century." Today I take this opportunity to thank the network for giving us these reminders of this great man's contribution to Britain, to the free world, and to his other country.

What a life was his. What a channel he was for the forces of good. How privileged we have been to have lived during the long years when he challenged all free people to match his courage to meet the full measure of his faith in his country.

"We will win." How often those words rang out loud and clear in those terrible years—in the voice that carried them across the world.

Undaunted he never accepted defeat. Unflinching he led his people to victory.

In deepest gratitude for the "Churchill Hour" I would say to you who share with me the privileges and responsibilities of this U.S. Congress that there never was a time in our history when we so needed that same courage and vision and determination.

I challenge each one of you to renew your faith in these United States—to say to yourselves, to our country, and to the world "We can and we will win this battle for decency and honor which is being waged within our borders and in all corners of the globe."

Is there no one who will come forth and give us a clarion call to the battle we must wage against the false gods of discouragement and despair? Is there no one who will challenge us to fill our Government positions with men whose blood is the blood of heroes that we may hear on all sides the call that Sir Winston gave the free world in its darkest days "We will win"?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman from Ohio, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, has made an inspir-

ing statement and I commend her, and would like to associate myself with her thoughts.

With the death of Sir Winston Churchill, England has lost a great leader, statesman, and soldier, maker and recorder of history. And the free world has lost the greatest fighter for freedom of this century. When England stood alone against the onslaught of Nazi tyranny, it was Churchill who summoned the English language to battle and in so doing prepared his people for the dark days that followed. Surely, hindsight must tell us that his leadership, his perseverance, and his courage not only changed the course of history, but may indeed have saved it from entering a new dark age in the midst of the 20th century.

As an author, Churchill has left us with a valuable insight for our own future course of action. In his book "The Gathering Storm" he perceived:

If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight when all the odds are against you and only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than to live as slaves.

In evaluating Sir Winston's place in history, his own comments during the Battle of Britain could well be paraphrased: never have so many owed so much to one man.

U.S. GROUP OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1965, there was held the annual meeting of the U.S. group of the Interparliamentary Union.

At that time, officers were elected and the report of the executive secretary received. For the information of my colleagues, I will place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the slate of officers elected and the text of the report.

However, I would like to make special mention of the election of our former colleague, Katharine St. George, as an honorary member of the group and also as its secretary. This is fitting recognition of her exceptional talents which have been so effectively employed in this activity for many years.

We recall her skill as a parliamentarian, her linguistic ability, her forthrightness in debate, as well as her charm and understanding in personal relations. Likewise, we remember her splendid leadership of the U.S. group during the last Congress. She has done much to gain respect and friendship for our country through her fine work in the Union, and it is good news for us all that she

has been cast in an appropriate role to permit future participation.

The full slate of officers and the report are as follows:

U.S. GROUP OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

President: HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Senator from Georgia.

Vice Presidents: GORDON ALLOTT, Senator from Colorado; ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Representative from New York; JOHN SPARKMAN, Senator from Alabama.

Treasurer: PAUL C. JONES, Representative from Missouri.

Secretary: KATHARINE ST. GEORGE.

Executive committee: Herman E. Talmadge, Senator from Georgia; Gordon Allott, Senator from Colorado; Alexander Pirnie, Representative from New York; John Sparkman, Senator from Alabama; Paul C. Jones, Representative from Missouri; Katharine St. George; W. Robert Poage, Representative from Texas; E. Ross Adair, Representative from Indiana; Thomas H. Kuchel, Senator from California.

Honorary members: Homer Ferguson, judge, Military Court of Appeals; Katharine St. George.

Permanent executive secretary: Dr. George B. Galloway.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY U.S. GROUP INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, 1964

During the calendar year 1964 members of the U.S. group participated in three interparliamentary conferences. The first was the Third Pan-American Interparliamentary Conference, held at the Pan American Union, February 5-7, 1964, at the invitation of the U.S. group which planned, organized, and conducted the meeting. Mrs. St. George was elected permanent chairman of the Conference which was attended by delegations from the National Parliaments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela. The Canadian and Spanish groups were represented by observers. The president of the Interparliamentary Council, Mr. Ranieri Mazzilli, and the secretary general of the Union, Mr. Andre de Blonay, also attended. Lively and interesting debates were held on the operation of the Alliance for Progress and on strengthening parliamentary institutions in the Americas. The Conference also amended the statutes of the Inter-American Regional Group, elected new officers, and agreed to hold the Fourth Regional Conference in Argentina in 1965.

The Third American Interparliamentary Conference heard addresses by Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; Andre de Blonay, Secretary General of the Interparliamentary Union; and Dr. Jose Mora, Secretary General of the Organization of American States. Official receptions were given to the delegates at the State Department and in the OAS headquarters, as well as a luncheon at the Cosmos Club. At the conclusion of the sessions, the delegates were taken on a visit to Cape Kennedy where they were shown some of the latest American space missiles.

The second meeting in which members of the U.S. group participated during 1964 was the spring meeting of the IPU Council and standing committees held in Lucerne, Switzerland, March 30 to April 5, 1964.

Two hundred and twenty-six Members of Parliament from 44 different countries in all regions of the world participated. The delegation from the United States consisted of Representative Katharine St. George, chairman; Representatives W. R. Poage, Alexander Pirnie, Emilio Q. Daddario, F. Bradford Morse, and Robert McClory; and Senators Gordon Allott and Mike Monroney. Dr. George B. Galloway, executive secretary; Darrell St. Claire, fiscal officer; and Dr. Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the

House of Representatives, accompanied the delegation.

The conference opened with a general session at which the delegates were welcomed by Swiss officials of Lucerne. Four days of the conference were devoted to a series of meetings by the five standing study committees of the Union. The political and disarmament committee, on which the United States was represented by Representatives PIRNIE and MORSE, debated four topics: (1) possible steps toward general disarmament, (2) relations between political and military alliances, (3) active coexistence and future international law, and (4) adaptation of the United Nations Charter and working methods to the requirements of an enlarged international society.

The Parliamentary and Juridical Committee, on which Representative DADDARIO represented the United States, discussed the report of its Subcommittee on Space Law, and considered the international protection of human rights and the role of members of parliament as intermediaries between the citizens and governments.

The Economic and Social Committee, where Senator MONRONEY and Representative POAGE represented the United States, debated the fight against disparities in world economy, including (1) the role of international organizations in technical cooperation and development assistance, (2) means of insuring more extensive exchanges between countries with different political regimes and economic levels, and (3) the demographic problem: the present situation and proposed solutions.

The Cultural Committee, on which Representative McCLORY represented the United States, discussed democratic access to educational facilities and the fight against illiteracy in the developing countries. And the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories, where Senator ALLOTT represented the United States, considered the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on Colonialism. On all these topics the U.S. delegation was equipped with position papers prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

During the Conference the Executive Committee of the Union held its 131st session and the Interparliamentary Council held its 94th session. Representative Katharine St. George and Senator ALLOTT represented the United States at the session of the Interparliamentary Council.

The five permanent study committees submitted an account of their work to the Interparliamentary Council which, at a meeting held on April 4, drew up the agenda for the 53d Interparliamentary Conference to be held in Copenhagen from August 20 to 28, 1964.

During the session of the Council on April 4 it was agreed to postpone until the Copenhagen Conference action on the application of the Republic of South Korea for reinstatement in the Union and not to admit observers from South Vietnam to the floor of the 53d Conference. Proposals formulated by the Executive Committee regarding the status and rights of honorary members of national groups at interparliamentary conferences were accepted by the Council. Secretary General Andre de Blonay was elected to that office for the period from July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1969. The Council elected the Honorable M. Senanayake, member of the Parliament of Ceylon, to fill the vacancy on the Executive Committee caused by the dissolution of the South Vietnam Parliament and the withdrawal of Mr. Thiep. A proposal by Mr. Hermann Kopf, of the Federal Republic of Germany to change the name of the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories was debated in the Council, but a decision on a new name was postponed until the Copenhagen meeting.

During the Lucerne meetings Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE was elected Vice Chairman of the Committee on Political Questions, International Security and Disarmament;

and Representative ROBERT McCLORY was elected rapporteur of the Committee on Cultural Questions.

At the invitation of the Spanish group of the Interparliamentary Union, the U.S. delegation to the Lucerne meetings spent a few days in Spain as guests of the Spanish group, some of whose members had previously been entertained by the U.S. group in Washington. While in Madrid the congressional delegation was received at a reception in their honor given by the American Ambassador, Mr. Woodward, at his residence.

The delegation was also taken on a tour of the Cortes, the National Parliament of Spain, by the vice president of that body. Several members of the U.S. delegation also visited the Rota Naval Station. The generous hospitality of the Spanish group was deeply appreciated and greatly enjoyed.

The third meeting in which members of the U.S. group took part during 1964 was the 53d Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, held in Copenhagen, Denmark, August 20-28, 1964. Five hundred and twenty-five delegates from sixty-six of the seventy-five member countries attending the meeting. The U.S. Congress was represented at the Conference by a delegation of 11 Senators and 13 Representatives.

Representatives St. George and PIRNIE represented the United States at the meetings of the Interparliamentary Council on August 19; and Senator SPARKMAN and Mrs. St. George at the Council meeting on August 26. The agenda of the Council meetings included receipt of the Secretary General's report and the administrative report of the Geneva bureau for 1963-64; proposals for the election of officers of the 53d Conference; a report by the Executive Committee on the creation of new groups since the previous session of the Council; the organization of the 54th Conference to be held in Ottawa in September 1965; consideration of the place of meeting of the 55th Conference (Moscow, 1966); proposals of the names of Mr. Vilfan of Yugoslavia, Mr. Mbu of Nigeria, and Mr. Hacohen of Israel to fill three vacant seats on the Executive Committee; and of Mr. Senanayake of Ceylon to replace Mr. Thiep of the Republic of Vietnam who had lost his parliamentary mandate. The above-mentioned delegates were subsequently elected to the Executive Committee. The Council also decided to hold the spring sessions of 1965, 1966, and 1967 at Dublin, Ireland, Canberra, Australia, and Mallorca, Spain, respectively.

During the Copenhagen Conference the five standing study committees of the Union met, considered amendments to their draft resolutions, exchanged views on their 1965 work programs, and adopted recommendations for submission to the Executive Committee. The United States was represented on these study committees by the following delegates:

1. Committee on political questions, international security, and disarmament: Senators SPARKMAN and STENNIS and Representatives PIRNIE, DADDARIO, and SMITH.
2. Parliamentary and Judicial Committee: Representatives DADDARIO and Tollefson.
3. Economic and Social Committee: Senator BENNETT and Representative POAGE.
4. Committee on non-self-governing territories and ethnic questions: Senator KUCHEL and Representative DERWINSKI.
5. Cultural committee: Representative McCLORY, who was the rapporteur of the committee, and Representatives WHALLEY and MORSE.

Five days of the Conference were devoted to general debate on the Secretary General's report and on the following subjects:

1. The fight against disparities in world economy.
2. Adaptation of the United Nations Charter and working methods to the requirements of an enlarged international society.

3. The problem of education and the fight against illiteracy.

4. The role of members of parliament as intermediaries between the citizens and their government.

Delegates of the United States participated actively in all these debates which took place in plenary sessions. Mrs. Katherine St. George, chairman of the delegation, spoke in the general debate on "The Role of Parliament in a Changing World." In the debate on the fight against disparities in world economy Representatives ADAIR and JONES were the American spokesmen. Senator SPARKMAN and Representative PRINIE presented the American viewpoint in the debate on the adaptation of the U.N. Charter. Representative McCLOREY submitted the report of the Cultural Committee on the problem of education and fight against illiteracy. And Senator TALMADGE spoke on the meaning of literacy in our times. Senator ALLOTT and Representative MORSE spoke for the United States on the role of Members of Parliament as intermediaries between citizens and governments.

While en route to Copenhagen, the U.S. delegation paid brief visits to Oslo, capital of Norway, and to Stockholm, capital of Sweden. In Oslo the delegation received a briefing on economic, social, and political conditions in Norway at the American Embassy from Ambassador Wharton and his staff. The delegation also visited the Storting, Norway's Parliament, where the Ambassador and Representative Tollefson presented to Storting President Langhelle engrossed copies of the congressional resolution congratulating the Storting on the 150th anniversary of the Norwegian Constitution. In an eloquent and moving televised speech, spoken in Norwegian, Representative Tollefson referred to his Norwegian ancestry and stressed the close ties that bind Norway and the United States together.

After a tour of the Storting, the U.S. group was entertained by the Norwegian Interparliamentary Group at a luncheon at the Shipping Club. Finn Moe, chairman of the foreign affairs committee, was the host. Senator HICKENLOOPER responded in a fine speech of warm appreciation. While in Oslo, Embassy visits were also arranged to Frogner Park with its famous Vigeland collection of sculptures, to Oslo's unique city hall, and to the Viking ships, *Kon-Tiki*, and Munch Museums.

At Stockholm the delegation received an instructive briefing by Ambassador James Graham Parsons at the American Embassy chancery. Later, Ambassador and Mrs. Parsons gave a reception in honor of the congressional delegation at their residence to which leading members of the Swedish Government, Parliament, banking, business, labor, science, and the press were invited. The delegation was also entertained at a reception at the Royal Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Conducted tours were arranged by the Embassy to the principal sights of the city, including a visit to *Vasa*, a 17th century warship, sunk in 1628, and recently raised from Stockholm harbor; Skansen, open-air museum and amusement park; Millesgarden; town hall; and Drottningholm Palace.

Upon arrival at Copenhagen, the U.S. delegation were met at the airport by Ambassador Katharine E. White and members of her staff. Later, the delegation received an informative briefing at the American chancery by our Ambassador and her leading aids on the government, economy, and foreign relations of Denmark. Ambassador White also gave a reception at her residence for the IPU delegation to which Danish officials, the Danish delegation, and American businessmen were invited.

While in Copenhagen the international committee of the students' club of the city organized an informal discussion between a

panel of parliamentarians from the IPU Conference and a panel of leading Danish commentators on foreign politics. Senator HICKENLOOPER represented the U.S. Congress in this panel discussion on foreign affairs and ably upheld the American position in a lively and stimulating exchange with three leading Danish newspaper editors.

On the last day of the IPU Conference 10 members of the congressional delegation flew to Berlin where they were entertained at lunch at Harnack House by the U.S. commander and received situation and political briefings by General Polk and Minister Calhoun. In a 7-hour visit the party also took a tour of West Berlin and inspected the wall.

After the Copenhagen Conference several members of the U.S. delegation returned to the United States by way of Dublin, Ireland, where they were entertained at an airport luncheon by Hon. Frank Aiken, Irish Minister for External Affairs, and were given an official dinner by the Irish group of the IPU at the Gresham Hotel. There was also a reception at the U.S. Ambassador's residence in Phoenix Park.

In addition to participating in the three international Conferences described above, members of the U.S. group also met twice in the Capitol. They held their annual meeting at a luncheon in the Speaker's dining room on January 21, 1964, at which plans for the Third Pan-American Regional Conference were discussed. And they held a meeting on July 22 in the Senate conference room at which plans for the Copenhagen Conference were considered. These meetings were attended by Members of both Houses of Congress who had been appointed as delegates to these Conferences, and by staff aides.

During 1964 the executive secretary engaged in the following activities on behalf of the U.S. group:

1. Coordinated the preparation of background reports, position papers, and speech materials for the use of the congressional delegations to the spring meetings of the IPU at Lucerne, March 30-April 5, and to the 53d Conference of the Union at Copenhagen, August 20-28.

2. Prepared and sent to the Geneva bureau the annual report of the U.S. group for 1964, in accordance with article 3 of the IPU statutes.

3. Prepared a report on the Lucerne meeting of the IPU Council and standing study committees and distributed it to the officers of the U.S. group. Mrs. St. George inserted this report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 6, pages 8120-8121.

4. Accompanied the congressional delegations to the Lucerne and Copenhagen Conferences and attended to their needs.

5. Carried on an extensive correspondence with the Geneva bureau of the Union and with other national groups.

6. Distributed among the officers of the U.S. group various official publications and documents of the Union received from Geneva.

7. Escorted numerous visiting parliamentarians from abroad around the Capitol and entertained them at lunch and dinner at the Cosmos Club.

Planned and organized the third American regional meeting of the Union which was held in Washington, D.C., at the Pan American Union, February 5-7.

In closing this report I wish to make special acknowledgement to Mr. Darrell St. Claire, chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, for his many and invaluable services to the U.S. group as its fiscal officer. Mr. St. Claire was responsible for the arrangements for the Cape Kennedy trip in February, and for the hotel accommodations and the multifarious administrative arrangements for the U.S. delegations to the Lucerne and Copenhagen Conferences. His efficient, resourceful, and skillful compe-

tence was indispensable to the successful completion of these missions.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY,
Executive Secretary.

HORTON BILL TO REPEAL MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAX ON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill I am introducing today to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on photographic equipment.

This wartime-imposed 10-percent tax was instituted in 1941, increased in 1942 to 15 percent on some items and 25 percent on others, leveled at 20 percent in 1951, and returned to 10 percent under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, with the addition of a 5-percent tax on home projectors. My bill would amend the 1954 law by abolishing the present 10-percent manufacturers' excise tax, levied on cameras, lenses, and film and the 5-percent tax on home projectors.

I believe that as my fellow Members become more aware of the benefits this legislation will bring to all camera-carrying Americans as well as the photographic industry, they will join me in working for the elimination of this superfluous, discriminatory, and restrictive tax. For the following reasons, I urge prompt enactment of my proposal.

First, the Federal manufacturers' excise tax levied on photographic equipment is highly repressive—that is, it is levied contrary to our generally accepted philosophy of taxation according to ability to pay. Since these taxes are passed along and included in the purchase price of the commodity, they exert an especially punitive effect upon individuals in the lower income levels who can least afford to pay them.

Second, since the American consumer has just so much money available to spend on cameras, film and other photographic supplies, the excise tax only adds to the purchase price which must be charged for these products and makes it prohibitive for some persons to buy them. Decreased demand for photographic equipment discourages production and reduces employment in those firms engaged in manufacturing and retailing these items. The Federal Government also stands to lose as income tax revenues from business firms and individuals decline as a result of lower incomes and profits. Thus the restrictive effect of these taxes reacts adversely upon the entire American economy.

Past experience has demonstrated that reduction or elimination of excise taxes tends to spur consumption and provides our economy with the stimulus it needs.

For example, in April 1954, when the excise tax rate on photographic apparatus was reduced from 20 to 10 percent, it was immediately accompanied by a strong upsurge in sales of these products. During the past 5 years, however—from 1959 to 1963—sales of these taxed items have leveled off, while in contrast, sales of untaxed photographic supplies have continued to rise steadily year by year.

Third, I believe that the initial loss in Federal revenues which would accompany repeal the photographic excise taxes would soon be offset by rising income tax collections made possible by a more productive economy. Even the loss which would be felt at first would not be a significant one, since taxes on photographic supplies yielded only \$30 million in revenues during the fiscal year 1964.

Fourth, this tax is especially harsh in that it proliferates, or is encountered time and again. For example in buying a camera one is subject not only to the excise tax levied on this item, but the purchaser must also pay the 10-percent tax on the film he buys to use in the camera and on the projector he purchases to show the film. In testimony which was presented in 1955, it was demonstrated that the photographic excise tax was encountered at least 34 times in preparing a photographic illustration for inclusion in a book or magazine. Thus, the regressive effects of such a tax is intensified by this proliferation.

Fifth, suppliers and retailers of photographic supplies are compelled to tie up a considerable amount of their capital in taxes which must be paid on goods held in inventory. Generally, dealers in photographic supplies keep at least \$20,000 worth of merchandise on hand. A large portion of this will consist of taxable cameras, film, and projectors. Thus, these taxes work a real hardship on the small retailer, restricting the amount of supplies which he can afford to keep on hand and reducing his sales potential.

Finally, everything possible should be done to encourage such a highly creative and instructive hobby. Photographing highlights of travels and family and other social activities contributes greatly to the enjoyment of millions of Americans. Continuation of such a restrictive tax will only discourage many from pursuing a delightful and rewarding avocation.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent in Congress a portion of the city of Rochester, N.Y., birthplace and capital of much of the world's photographic industry. I have pointed out the competitive disadvantage of the photographic industry in our national economy—a fact that is especially distressing to my constituents whose livelihoods are so directly tied to this area. The remedy offered in my bill will have significant impact in Rochester. Similarly, it will be felt in homes, shops, and factories across the country.

In view of these considerations, we as legislators, consumers, and camera users can lift this heavy and unfair burden on the maker, seller, and buyer of photographic equipment by enacting this legislation.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SALUTES KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, an enterprising organization as well as a fellowship club whose membership numbers more than a quarter of a million men in over 5,000 clubs, Kiwanis International, celebrated the 50th anniversary of its founding on January 21, 1915.

This golden anniversary of Kiwanis International—a name synonymous with community service—offers an occasion for Kiwanians everywhere both to reflect on a half century of significant service and to rededicate themselves to the objectives of promoting comradeship and civic service.

In saluting Kiwanis International on this proud occasion, I also want to point with special pride to the illustrious role which my home community of Rochester, N.Y., has played in Kiwanian history.

From its founding, Kiwanis International has had many ties to Rochester. In fact, the first president of Kiwanis International, George F. Hixson, was a Rochesterian and served the organization from 1916 to 1918.

Reference to the local Kiwanis clubs also is important in our recognition of Kiwanis since the very essence of Kiwanis wherever it exists—the United States, Canada, Mexico, the Caribbean, Europe, or the Far East—is the local club.

A service organization for men, Kiwanis inspires in its members a sense of community leadership. They learn to share the burdens of their fellow citizens, by doing human helpful things that less fortunate people cannot do for themselves, that individuals cannot accomplish except by collective action, that governments are not geared nor intended to do, and that just need doing for the good of all involved.

Kiwanis has been called "a phenomenon of the 20th century." This is so since its existence is evidence of social maturity: Members motivated by a common desire to serve and a desire for fellowship.

The activities—or, more appropriately, the good works—of Kiwanis can be seen all across our Nation and around the world. Just a skeleton listing of Kiwanian accomplishments would fill volumes. Even to recount the contributions of the Kiwanis clubs which serve the congressional district I represent would take many hours.

Kiwanis members render service to society at every level, among every group. Kiwanians work with boys and girls, with senior citizens, with the poor, the mentally retarded and the sick. They sponsor programs to increase church attendance, recruit teachers, improve safety standards, set up soil erosion projects, get out the vote, and point the way to career possibilities for high school and college students.

In all of these areas, we find close and careful concern for the objects of Kiwanis first set forth and adopted at the Denver convention in June 1924. Because they have such obvious meaning and motivation today, I take pleasure in repeating them as part of my remarks:

To give primacy to the human and spiritual rather than to the material values of life.

To encourage the daily living of the Golden Rule in all human relationships.

To promote the adoption and the application of higher social, business, and professional standards.

To develop, by precept and example, a more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship.

To provide, through Kiwanis clubs, a practical means to form enduring friendships, to render altruistic service, and to build better communities.

To cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism, which make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good will.

And, Mr. Speaker, I also believe it is fitting on this occasion to repeat the 10 Kiwanis objectives for 1965.

First. Build, defend, and preserve our heritage of freedom, our belief in God, and the dignity of man in his human and spiritual relationships.

Second. Build international understanding by demonstrating the basic principle of the Golden Rule, using as an example Canada-United States good will.

Third. Build an understanding of an appreciation for the private ownership of property by educating ourselves and our youth in the principles of a free capitalistic system.

Fourth. Build responsible government by insisting upon worthy and competent men in all positions.

Fifth. Build the highest standards of morality and integrity by encouraging organizations, businesses, professions, labor, and news media to adhere to self-regulated codes of ethics.

Sixth. Build youth for leadership through Circle K and Key clubs and other worthy youth organizations, and create a desire to achieve excellence.

Seventh. Build a more abundant existence by effective programs to preserve natural resources.

Eighth. Build safer communities and preserve life.

Ninth. Build opportunities for retiring and retired persons by developing programs which will enable them to make use of their skills and abilities.

Tenth. Build pride of Kiwanis membership by dramatizing the golden anniversary and telling the Kiwanis story.

Mr. Speaker, on this golden anniversary of Kiwanis International it not only is my privilege to speak here in the House in tribute to Kiwanians the world over, but it also is my honor to act in behalf of the Genesee division of Kiwanis which serves the Rochester area with 23 Kiwanis clubs. I take pleasure in announcing that at the request of the division's lieutenant governor, Leonard N. Pilaroscia, who is my constituent, that I am today presenting a golden anniversary Kiwanis pen to our distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and to the President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson.

I salute Kiwanis and Kiwanians as they enter upon their second half century of fulfilling their motto: "We Build."

THE 1965 REAL ESTATE BOARD OF ROCHESTER, PRESIDENT FRED B. KRAVETZ, SPEAKS OF REALTOR ACCOMPLISHMENT

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this past Thursday, January 21, it was my pleasure to be present for the Installation Dinner of the Real Estate Board of Rochester, N.Y., Inc. I was there because the realtors of my home community mean a great deal to me and because my good friend and constituent, Fred B. Kravetz, was installed for his second term in the board's presidency.

Realtors have a special place in the communities of our Nation. They are businessmen, but they also are zealous protectors of sacred rights secured to all of us by the U.S. Constitution.

In Rochester, realtors have an outstanding record of civic service and accomplishment. These men and women are partners in the progress we are achieving and, in many cases, the inspiration or impetus for it.

So that my colleagues in the House of Representatives can read and review the elements which make up this past year's contributions to the community from the realtors of Rochester, I take pleasure in sharing the speech which President Kravetz delivered on the occasion of his installation:

Ladies and gentlemen, welcome once again to the annual installation dinner of the Real Estate Board of Rochester.

On behalf of the officers and directors of the board, may I thank you for honoring us tonight with your presence. It is gratifying and flattering to us that your interest in the board and its activities takes such tangible form as the fine turnout in evidence here. It seems that all the important people of the Nation are here tonight attending this great event. I hope that Lyndon Baines isn't too lonely at his inauguration in Washington.

This occasion also gives me the opportunity to express a personal note of thanks to each of you for your confidence in reelecting me president of the Real Estate Board for 1965. This, as you know, is my second term in the presidency, and someone has remarked that, if I am given a third leg on it, it may mean permanent possession. However, I want to assure you tonight I have no such Rooseveltian aspirations. Two years in office are enough for any man who must also conduct the daily affairs of his own business. Being an officer can cut deeply into the time normally accorded the day-to-day task of deriving a living.

The situation is somewhat analogous to a priest who liked to play golf, and he asked his bishop what he considered a fair amount of time for this recreation. "Well," said the bishop wisely, "if you play in the hundreds, you're neglecting your golf; and if you play in the seventies, you're neglecting your parish."

The position of the presidency is constantly one of blood, sweat, and tears. It is impossible to foretell the precise nature of the problems that will confront you. You have to expect the pleasure of office sit-ins, badgering, abuse, and ridicule, but the prospect of ultimate accomplishment impels you to continue.

I have learned to know and understand the pulse and nerve center of this board. I stand ready to serve it with whatever vitality I possess.

Tonight I should like to review some of the accomplishments of the board during the past year and then to project some goals for the future.

When we speak of achievements, one of the most notable has been the improved image of the realtor in the Greater Rochester area. Somehow or other in the past, we have appeared to be against things without always having an acceptable counterproposal of our own.

During 1964 we attempted to create a more positive program. On controversial civic questions we went on record with policy statements of our position and recommendations, and it undoubtedly helped our cause to publicize ourselves as businessmen trying, like others, to rear families in this fine community of ours.

Representatives of the real estate board have appeared on their own time to present statements to such governing bodies as city council and the board of supervisors; to participate in interfaith meetings throughout this community; to address neighborhood improvement associations and, in cooperation with the Rochester Safety Council, to pay tribute to the winner of the annual clean-up, fix-up, paint-up campaign won last year by the Southside Neighborhood Association.

Further, some of our members have appeared on such radio shows as Eddie Meath's and Dorothy Cotton's to explain our activities during National Realtor Week, and we have participated in television discussions on redevelopment and rehabilitation of our inner city.

The Real Estate Board of Rochester saluted Bill Kane at a luncheon as realtor of the year, and we were most proud when recently one of our number, Realtor Robert Pierce, was honored twice in the same day for his heroism in breaking into a burning home and snatching back from the jaws of death a 1-year-old infant who, because of the heavy smoke, seemed certain to perish.

All these incidents and activities, plus continued and vigorous publicity, tended to enhance our image as realtors among the Rochester community. In the line of paid advertising we continued to keep the name, seal, and services of the realtor before the vast audience on radio and TV and in the newspapers.

What does an average observer see when he envisages a realtor?

He sees an individual happily building homes and cities—interested in his community and family—prosperous—contributing to the general welfare. He sees a realtor on the city council, zoning board, the civic planning commission, interested in politics and growth, a homeowner, a tenant, a stable, solid citizen, and member of the Real Estate Board of Rochester.

Now that is quite a bit to say of any man.

A year ago, when I attended the inauguration of NAREB President Ed Mendenhall in Washington, D.C., he said:

"There is no more appropriate and direct manner in which a realtor can discharge his civic responsibility than in giving his wholehearted support to municipal officials in shaking the dust from the housing codes, bringing them up to date, and giving them meaningful and impressive reinforcement."

"We should give our special attention * * * to the cold fact that enactment of a housing

code does not improve housing. It takes enforcement to do that. This is an urgent field of action in which the municipality has a power that the Federal Government lacks."

How did we react to this appeal?

You know the answer as well as I. Rochester realtors were in large part responsible for the passage by the city council in August 1964, of an improved housing code. This code is designed to prevent overcrowding, and it also prescribes minimum standards of heating, plumbing, ventilation, and electricity.

At the time this desirable legislation was passed, however, the real estate board, while praising city council, sounded a warning that the new housing code would be only as good as its means of enforcement. The board stressed the point that through the intelligent administration of the property rehabilitation code we can preserve the housing we already have in the city.

There are so many things a realtor can do. Midtown is a brilliant example in which private capital—risk capital—cooperated with realtors and city government to bring about a successful enterprise that won the admiration of the Nation.

As realtors we believe in the concept that under all is the land. We further believe that upon its wise utilization and widely allocated ownership depend the survival and growth of free institutions and of our civilization. Realtors in Rochester have pioneered in urban renewal. They have played an important part in fostering and encouraging adoption by the city of the property rehabilitation and conservation code without which urban renewal programs are literally impossible.

Realtors have played an important part in urban renewal programs, from redevelopment of the Culver-Norton-Fernwood-Goodman area, which was one of the earliest and most successful urban renewal projects in the entire country to Midtown Plaza and Genesee Crossroads. We have been in a position to observe the success of these projects.

Realtors have been among the earliest proponents of urban renewal programs and have published blueprints for neighborhood conservation; the original edition was published in 1953 and it has been revised and updated to meet changing conditions. As realtors we are well aware that cities are built not by planners, but by decisions made in the marketplace, by the willingness of people to buy, sell, and invest, lease, and operate in the expectation of making profits. A city is concerned with improving its tax base and operating more efficiently and attracting new business, new industries, new investments enhancing the convenience, safety, health, and welfare of its citizens.

There is no other valid reason for encouraging urban renewal projects. Urban renewal efforts that fail to understand and take into account the needs and abilities of people are bound to fail. Worse, any such program will compound the bad effects and will damage, perhaps irreparably, the fabric that comprises the whole complex of our urban community.

Above all, we must realize that we could not solve the basic problems by simple relocating people from one area to another or by herding them into subsidized housing. Any urban renewal program inevitably requires sacrifices on the part of owners and tenants directly affected. Urban renewal is essential to the life of the community. It is costly to the taxpayers in terms of revenues lost to redevelopment. It is of the utmost importance that these sacrifices and expenses ultimately achieve the goals intended. Many of the problems leading to the need for urban renewal programs have arisen from our failure to understand and meet the needs and abilities of marginal families and marginal businesses, which

comprise a significant portion of our urban renewal complex.

Our goal in the year ahead should be the continued improvement of the realtor's image: every realtor electing responsible legislators, and participating in worthy civic ventures where he has the ability to serve others. This outstanding community has a right to expect that our realtors are highly qualified, specialized people; more is expected of us. Our image must continue to be one of respect and responsibility. In one important respect the Real Estate Board of Rochester is the envy of the Nation. Through it are channeled better than 80 percent of the real estate transactions in this community.

Realtors in Rochester are a professionally minded, harmonious group. Through our cooperative efforts, especially in the efficiency of realtor photo multiple listings, we can sell a home in most instances within 45 days.

Our local board is in healthy condition. It furnishes an important spur to the general economy. No other business group can better evaluate every neighborhood as to the danger of deterioration into slums, for no other group is so closely associated with all factions of the economic scale.

We are striving in 1965 to make ourselves more competent realtors than ever before so that we may better serve our clients and the community. As a real estate board with a civic conscience, we have supported programs in the general interest to improve Rochester, and we shall continue to support them. However, we shall also oppose programs we deem not in the best interest of this community's proper future growth.

Our participation with the Rochester Safety Council is one good example. We have worked with it for better protection of neighborhoods, and we have joined with the Citizens' Tax League to watch constantly over the community's tax base. We have sponsored the annual "Civic Pride" luncheon to emphasize to the public some of the finest attributes of our outstanding community.

The real estate board is 55 years old in 1965—55 in 65. Born in 1910, it has matured into an important entity in this great community.

The Real Estate Board of Rochester has just completed another most successful year. We hope now not only to maintain the momentum we have generated, but to achieve even greater success for you in 1965.

Thank you.

THE LATE HONORABLE SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, Great Britain and the United States have lost a son without peer. Sir Winston Churchill bestrode the free world like a mighty colossus. He was—as President de Gaulle has said of his role in the great drama of World War II—"the greatest."

Our century may not see his like again. His courage was indomitable. His sense of the course of history was clear and oft-times prophetic. His eloquence was unmatched. His flashing wit could uplift a nation or devastate a mean thrust. His leadership in the House of Commons, in power and out, was formidable and farseeing.

Few men in high public life have written of history—and of history they made—with such authority and with such sweep.

For the future, Churchill will in some measure be part of all of us. His voice and his words will always beat the call to courage and to principle—whenever freedom and human dignity stand in danger; wherever tyranny raises up its head and whenever the time comes for freemen to stand together undaunted and unafraid.

I am sure all in this House deeply mourn his passing and extend all sympathy to his family, to his Queen and to Great Britain and the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following editorials for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1965]

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

The power and the glory are gone, the soaring oratory, the eloquent pen, the cherubic face, the impish twinkle in his eyes, the jaunty cigar, the vitality that sparked a world.

One measure of Churchill's greatness is that no one today, now that the blaze of his genius has subsided into dust and ashes, need explain or describe or grope for words. He is one of those rare figures in history who stand like skyscrapers above the merely great. Usually history waits to recognize its supreme leaders, but there is no need to wait in Churchill's case.

He was Britain's glory in a special way, for he somehow managed to personify what is magnificent in the English race, and what is most appealing—John Bull with imperfections and eccentricities, but with the courage, the doggedness, the loyalty, the strength. Many who sought to isolate the essential quality of his greatness fastened upon his astonishing vitality. Never was there a man so durable, so indefatigable, so indomitable. It is almost incredible that there was a man among us yesterday who rode in the charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman and was a Member of Parliament under Queen Victoria, but who served as his nation's Prime Minister as late as 1955.

Yet durability and vitality are not in themselves a guarantee of greatness. They only assured him life and dominance at a moment of history when all his gifts and those of his people could combine to produce the miracle of Britain in the Second World War.

There was some quality of anticlimax about the rest. When the Great War was won, Winston Churchill was rejected as his nation's leader. A few of his military commanders were critical in their memoirs of some of his wartime decisions—as an earlier generation had been critical of his Gallipoli campaign in 1915-16.

A decade ago his work was done, in the sense that he no longer had the strength to carry on in his beloved House of Commons, although he remained an M.P. almost to the end. In some ways the whole of his life was devoted to the House of Commons. He did go on writing and, in fact, the fourth and last volume of his monumental "History of the English-Speaking Peoples" was only published in 1958. Writing for him was always an avocation although for years he had to make a living out of it and he wrote superbly.

He was, too, an orator whose speeches were never dull and sometimes reached the most inspiring heights of which our language is capable. Like Shakespeare, he will be full of quotations so long as the English language lives. But no one in later generations will ever recapture the thrill that came to us, listening over the radio in moments of glory and agony, as we heard Winston Churchill speak of blood, toil, tears and sweat, of their

finest hour, of fighting on the beaches, in the fields, in the streets, of so much being owed by so many to so few.

In the sweet, sad process of looking back we have the consolation of these memories. A man like Winston Churchill makes everyone a part of his life, as if a little of that greatness were shared by each of us. That he should have been half American as well as all English was a special source of pleasure to Americans. Nowhere beyond his native land will he be more sincerely mourned than throughout the length and breadth of these United States.

Winston Churchill was the glory of a tremendous era in history encompassed by the two World Wars. He leaves one feeling that an age has gone into history with him. Years ago he wrote that he gave sincere thanks to the high gods for the gift of existence. We, too, have reason to be thankful for that gift.

One would like to think of his passing in terms jotted down in a notebook by another supremely great human being, Leonardo da Vinci: "Just as a day well spent brings happy sleep, so a life well spent brings happy death."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 25, 1965]

JOHN CROSBY IN LONDON: THE GREATEST MAN

LONDON.—I love the story about the little boy whose mother took him to Chartwell and promised to introduce him to the greatest man in the world. Unfortunately, Winston Churchill was ill that day and the visit was called off. But the little boy slipped off down a corridor and followed a waiter into the sickroom. There he marched up and asked: "Are you the greatest man in the world?"

"Yes, I am," snarled Sir Winston. "Now push off."

He was, too, but I've always felt his greatest moments were, not during the war, but before it. England stood alone in 1940 and the great speeches—"blood, toil, tears, and sweat," "we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills, we shall never surrender," "this was their finest hour" and the rest—thundered throughout the free world.

This was England's great ordeal but Winston Churchill's great ordeal came earlier, when with his monumental vision, he thundered unheard, unheeded, virtually unread, and unprinted his great warnings about the growing military power and intentions of Germany. Then, Churchill stood alone, against virtually all of England, to say nothing of its allies.

In 1936, when Hitler reoccupied the Rhineland, the shock waves rocked the chancelleries of the world but it was Churchill alone who specifically spelled out in precise terms, in a speech before the House of Commons, the military significance of this action.

"The creation of a line of forts opposite to the French front will enable German troops to be economized on that line and will enable the main forces to swing through Belgium and Holland," he said. This was in 1936, mind you, 2½ years before World War II started. Four years later, the German forces did exactly that.

"The whole aspect," Churchill said in his speech, "of the Baltic States, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, with which must be associated Yugoslavia, Rumania, Austria, and some other countries are all affected very decisively the moment this great work of reconstruction is completed." All these prophecies were appallingly accurate.

It was not a popular speech. England was in a mood of business as usual. Stanley Baldwin was Prime Minister and a very popular one. Some of Churchill's greatest

speeches were blasts of withering scorn against the flaccidities of Baldwin's government:

"The Government cannot make up their minds, or they cannot get the Prime Minister to make up his mind. So they go on in strange paradox, decided only to be undecided, resolved to be irresolute, adamant for drift, solid for fluidity, all powerful to be impotent. So we go on preparing more months and years—precious, perhaps vital, for the greatness of Britain—for the locusts to eat."

Six months later Baldwin resigned and Churchill later wrote: "[Baldwin] laid down his wide authority he had carefully gathered and maintained but used as little as possible. He departed in a public glow of gratitude and esteem." Churchill was in anything but a public glow of gratitude or esteem.

In July 1936, 4 years before England was to be saved by a handful of Spitfire pilots, Churchill told a select committee of great public figures in the Prime Minister's room at the House of Commons: "We are facing the greatest danger and emergency in our history. At all costs, we must draw the flower of our youth into piloting airplanes. We must accelerate and simplify our aircraft production and push it to the largest scale. We are in danger as we have never been in danger before—no, not even at the height of the submarine campaign (of 1917)."

This prophetic utterance was totally discounted. The Government told Churchill his views were too gloomy, that nothing in the international situation justified upsetting the industrial life of the country or alarming the populace.

These were Churchill's finest hours when he was making prophecies of such stunning accuracy they could be put unchanged into the history books.

Churchill's darkest hours came well before World War II. One was Neville Chamberlain's rebuff of President Roosevelt's offer to mediate which Churchill considered "the last frail chance to save the world from tyranny otherwise than by war." The darkest hour was when Anthony Eden resigned as Foreign Secretary in protest against Chamberlain's appeasement policies on February 20, 1938.

"In a long life," he wrote, "I have had many ups and down. During all the war soon to come and in its darkest times, I never had any trouble sleeping. In the crisis of 1940, when so much responsibility lay upon me, and also at many other very anxious, awkward moments in the following 5 years, I could always flop into bed and go to sleep after the day's work was done. I slept sound and awoke refreshed and had no feelings except appetite to grapple with whatever the morning's boxes might bring. But on this night of February 20, 1938, and on this occasion alone, sleep deserted me. From midnight till dawn I lay on my bed consumed by emotions of sorrow and fear. I watched the daylight slowly creep in through the windows and saw before me in mental gaze the vision of death."

That was Churchill's darkest hour. England's came 2 years later in the Battle of Britain—September 15, 1940—when Churchill asked a subordinate: "How many Spitfires have we in reserve?"

"None, sir," was the reply.

"Then we must press forward the attack," said Churchill lightheartedly. That was the night the German air armadas finally desisted and the Battle of Britain was over just when Germany might have won it.

By then, Churchill was the beloved, indomitable hero of the whole free world. But I like him best when he was unloved—and still indomitable. That's the true best.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I read in the papers that the supplemental appropriation for the Department of Agriculture in excess of \$1 billion will be up for consideration on Tuesday, that is, tomorrow.

I made an effort to get a copy of the hearings and a copy of the report so that I could study up on this matter. None was available. So, this morning I called the Committee on Appropriations, and I also called the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations and at both places asked for a copy of the hearings. None was available. I was told that the hearings and the report will not be available until about 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, which is about 2 hours ahead of the time set for consideration of this very important and very large appropriation bill.

I would like to have the opportunity to read this material ahead of the consideration of the matter on the House floor and no doubt some other Members would also like the opportunity.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MAHON. A hearing was held on this matter. I have a copy of the page proof of the transcript. I would be very glad to make that available to the gentleman and I will do so. We have been pressed for time on the request to repair the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as the gentleman knows. Time is of the essence in the matter. We had some notice of the probabilities of this supplemental request during the debate on the regular appropriation bill here on the floor last year.

When I make some remarks on the new budget in a few minutes, I will arrange to include in them some additional information about the CCC supplemental item. I quite agree that the gentleman, and all other Members who are interested, should have as much advance information as we reasonably can supply, we want to cooperate and we will cooperate. Time has been short, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would it not be helpful if we could set over the consideration of this bill at least a day in order to give all Members an opportunity to read the hearings and study up on this very important bill?

Mr. MAHON. We were advised that the Commodity Credit Corporation needed this money last week. They are almost out of money and unable to meet commitments. It is imperative that we take action at the earliest possible moment. However, the hearings are short

and the problem is easy to understand, so I think we can and should manage to dispose of the matter tomorrow.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would 1 day's delay be that important, I will ask the gentleman?

Mr. MAHON. We ought to move forward as we had planned I would say.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES, FISCAL YEAR 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 15)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am presenting to you today the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1966.

A budget is a plan of action. It defines our goals, charts our courses, and outlines our expectations. It reflects hard decisions and difficult choices. This budget is no exception.

It is a budget of priorities. It provides for what we must do, but not for all we would like to do.

It is a budget of both opportunity and sacrifice. It begins to grasp the opportunities of the Great Society. It is restrained by the sacrifices we must continue to make in order to keep our defenses strong and flexible.

This budget provides reasonably for our needs. It is not extravagant. Neither is it miserly.

It stands on five basic principles:

Government fiscal policies must promote national strength, economic progress, and individual opportunity.

Our tax system must continue to be made less burdensome, more equitable, and more conducive to continued economic expansion.

The Great Society must be a bold society. It must not fear to meet new challenges. It must not fail to seize new opportunities.

The Great Society must be a compassionate society. It must always be responsive to human needs.

The Great Society must be an efficient society. Less urgent programs must give way to make room for higher priority needs. And each program, old and new, must be conducted with maximum efficiency, economy, and productivity.

The major features of the 1966 budget translate these principles into action.

First, excise taxes are substantially reduced. Social security benefits, including hospital insurance, are increased. These are combined with other expenditure increases to yield an overall fiscal policy designed to maintain our steady economic expansion.

Second, the budget supports a massive defense establishment of steadily growing power, within reduced outlays.

Third, our international and space programs are being advanced at a satisfactory rate, but with smaller increases than in earlier years.

Fourth, expanded programs and higher expenditures are proposed to:

Provide better and more education for our children.

Extend the war against poverty.

Promote advances in the Nation's health.

Improve conditions in the urban areas where most of us live.

Help the Appalachian region lift itself out of its present depressed condition.

Strengthen our social security protection.

Increase economic opportunities in rural communities.

Encourage sound use of our natural resources.

Conserve natural beauty in our land.

Fifth, a large part of the funds for needed program expansion has come from savings, reductions, and economies in other parts of the budget.

FISCAL POLICY

This budget recognizes that a growing economy is needed to promote national strength and progress. It is also needed to move us toward a balanced budget. When the economy slows down, Federal revenues fall and spending tends to increase. The result is larger, not smaller, budget deficits.

Nearly 4 years ago, this Nation began its fourth postwar economic expansion. With the help of last year's income tax reduction—the largest and most comprehensive ever enacted—this expansion has already outlasted each of the previous three postwar recoveries.

During the past 4 years, the Nation's real output of goods and services—the gross national product—has grown at an average rate of about 5 percent per year.

New highs have been achieved in employment, income, and profits. Unemployment has been reduced. Price stability has been maintained.

This is a creditable record of achievement. And we look forward to continued growth in the year ahead. The Nation's output in calendar year 1965 is expected to reach \$660 billion, plus or minus \$5 billion.

Nevertheless, we must keep in mind that our economy is still producing at a level well below its potential. Nearly 4 million people are out of work. The unemployment rate is still nearly 5 percent. Plants and machines are standing idle while human wants and needs go unmet. An estimated 35 million people continue to live in poverty.

We cannot substitute last year's achievements for next year's goals; nor can we meet next year's challenge with last year's budget.

The revenue and expenditure proposals presented in the 1966 budget are carefully designed to promote continued economic expansion and improved economic opportunities.

This budget takes into account the need to reduce the Nation's balance-of-payments deficit. During the last calendar year, the deficit showed a significant decline. To help insure continued improvement, I will intensify efforts to

carry out Federal activities with the least possible burden on our balance of payments.

BUDGET SUMMARY

Administrative budget: In preparing this budget, I have applied exacting tests of efficiency and necessity to all proposed expenditures. As a result, total administrative budget expenditures are being held to \$99.7 billion in 1966. Although expenditures will rise by a relatively small amount, they will decline as a percent of the gross national product—to less than 15 percent, the lowest ratio achieved in 15 years.

Administrative budget receipts are expected to increase in 1966 to \$94.4 billion. This is \$3.2 billion over the estimated level for 1965. This increase reflects the economic growth anticipated in calendar year 1965. It also takes into account the revenue losses from proposed excise tax changes and from the second stage of income tax cuts enacted last year.

The resulting 1966 administrative budget deficit of \$5.3 billion is \$1 billion lower than the 1965 deficit, marking continued progress toward a balanced budget.

As our population increases, as science and technology change our methods of doing things, as our wants multiply with the growth in our incomes, and as urban-

ization creates new problems, there is growing need for more public and private services. It is evident that unless defense needs should decline substantially, Government expenditures will continue to rise over the long run.

At the same time, we have good reason to expect that Government expenditures in the years ahead will grow more slowly than the gross national product, so that the ratio of Federal spending to our total output will continue to decline.

The expenditures proposed in this budget reflect a careful balancing of national goals against budgetary costs. The budget I now present will, in my judgment, carry out the responsibilities of the Federal Government efficiently and wisely. It was constructed on that basis alone.

My budgets for both 1965 and 1966 have provided for major increases in areas of high national priority—particularly education, health, aid to the needy, housing, and the war on poverty. Also, for these 2 consecutive years, careful pruning of less urgent programs and vigorous cost reduction efforts have, on balance, resulted in lower expenditures in other major sectors of the budget. The application of these strict policies of priority and frugality is evident in the modest growth in administrative budget expenditures.

The changing Federal budget

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	Administrative budget expenditures				
	1964 actual	Change, 1964 to 1965	1965 estimate	Change, 1965 to 1966	1966 estimate
National defense and space.....	\$58.4	—\$1.3	\$57.1	—\$0.4	\$56.7
Interest.....	10.8	+ .5	11.3	+ .3	11.6
Health, labor, education, housing and community development, economic opportunity program, and aid to the needy.....	6.7	+ .7	7.4	+ 3.6	11.0
All other.....	21.8	— .1	21.7	— 1.3	20.4
Total, administrative budget.....	97.7	— .2	97.5	+ 2.2	99.7

Consolidated cash statement: The administrative budget is based on a definition of Federal spending which excludes such important Federal activities as social security and highway construction that are financed through trust funds. A more comprehensive measure of the Government's finances is the consolidated cash budget which covers all of the Government's programs.

On the consolidated cash basis, total payments to the public are estimated at \$127.4 billion in 1966. Total receipts from the public are estimated at \$123.5 billion, resulting in a net excess of payments of \$3.9 billion. The estimated increase of \$6 billion in cash payments in 1966 over 1965 is mostly in trust funds which are financed by special taxes.

About \$9.5 billion of the nondefense payments recommended in this budget—almost 2½ times the size of the entire cash deficit—represent an investment in physical and financial assets which will provide benefits to the Nation for many years to come. These payments are made for Federal civil public works, equipment, and loans as well as for highways, hospitals, and other State, local, and private assets.

Federal sector, national income accounts: Another measure of Federal finance which includes trust funds emphasizes the direct impact of Government fiscal activities on the economy. This measure is based on the national income accounts. Under this concept, Federal fiscal data are estimated on an accrual rather than a cash basis. Purely financial transactions—such as loan—which do not directly affect production or income are excluded. On this basis, the deficit for 1966 is estimated at \$6 billion.

Federal expenditures as measured by the national income accounts are estimated to rise by \$6.0 billion in 1966. This increase—covering both purchases of goods and services and other types of payments—will provide a strong stimulus for continued economic growth.

FEDERAL REVENUES

The Revenue Act of 1964 has played a major role in widening and strengthening our prosperity. At the beginning of this month, the second stage of the rate reductions provided under the act became effective. In total, last year's tax law will decrease consumer and business

tax liabilities by about \$14 billion in the current calendar year.

Summary of Federal receipts and payments
(Fiscal years. In billions)

Description	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
FEDERAL RECEIPTS			
Administrative budget receipts	\$89.5	\$91.2	\$94.4
Trust fund receipts	30.3	30.5	33.6
Deduct: Intragovernmental transactions	4.3	4.3	4.5
Total cash receipts from the public	115.5	117.4	123.5
Add: Adjustment from cash to accrual basis	— .7	— .9	— 1.8
Deduct: Receipts from loans, property sales, and other adjustments	.2	.5	.7
National income account receipts, Federal sector	114.7	116.0	121.0
FEDERAL PAYMENTS			
Administrative budget expenditures	97.7	97.5	99.7
Trust fund expenditures (including Government-sponsored enterprises)	28.9	29.0	32.9
Deduct: Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments	6.2	5.1	5.2
Total cash payments to the public	120.3	121.4	127.4
Add: Adjustment from cash to accrual basis	1.8	1.7	1.1
Deduct: Disbursements for loans, land purchases, and other adjustments	3.6	2.1	1.5
National income account expenditures, Federal sector	118.5	121.0	127.0
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS (+) OR PAYMENTS (—)			
Administrative budget	— 8.2	— 6.3	— 5.3
Receipts from and payments to the public	— 4.8	— 4.0	— 3.9
National income accounts, Federal sector	— 3.9	— 5.0	— 6.0

With this substantial change in income taxes completed, it is now appropriate to revise and adjust excise taxes as well. Some of the present excises are costly and inefficient to administer. Some impose onerous recordkeeping burdens on small business. Some distort consumer choices as among different kinds of goods.

Within the revenue requirements for continued progress toward a balanced budget, I believe it is vital that we correct the most pressing of these deficiencies this year. I plan to transmit to the Congress recommendations to repeal some excise taxes and reduce others. In addition to improving the tax system, the recommended changes will increase purchasing power and stimulate further growth in the economy.

These changes should become effective July 1, 1965. They will reduce tax liabilities on a full-year basis by \$1.75 billion. Revenues collected by the Treasury in 1966 will be reduced by \$1.5 billion.

My other major revenue proposals this year involve important activities financed through trust funds.

I am recommending prompt enactment of a hospital insurance program for elderly persons, who are finding hospital and medical costs far greater than their ability to pay. This program should be self-financing, with a combined employer-employee payroll contribution of

0.6 percent on the first \$5,600 of income to start in calendar year 1966.

Receipts from the public

(Fiscal years. In billions)

Source	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Administrative budget receipts:			
Individual income taxes	\$48.7	\$47.0	\$48.2
Corporation income taxes	23.5	25.6	27.6
Excise taxes	10.2	10.7	9.8
Other	7.1	7.9	8.8
Total administrative budget receipts	89.5	91.2	94.4
Trust fund receipts:			
Employment taxes	16.8	16.7	18.7
Deposits by States, unemployment insurance	3.0	3.0	2.9
Excise taxes	3.5	3.6	4.0
Federal employee and agency payments for retirement	2.0	2.2	2.2
Interest on trust fund investments	1.6	1.7	1.9
Veterans life insurance premiums	.5	.5	.5
Other	2.8	2.8	3.5
Total trust fund receipts	30.3	30.5	33.6
Intragovernmental transactions (deduct)	4.3	4.3	4.5
Total receipts from the public	115.5	117.4	123.5

I am also recommending an increase from \$4,800 to \$5,600 in the wage base on which social security taxes are paid. This would take effect on January 1, 1966, and would be coupled with a smaller increase in the payroll tax than is scheduled at that date under existing law. These changes will provide the funds for the needed increases being proposed in old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits.

While I am recommending reductions in certain excise taxes, I am also proposing increases in certain other excise taxes which are in the nature of user charges. The excise taxes for which I am recommending reduction or repeal are not associated with the provision of particular Government services. However, certain existing excises on transportation are in effect a charge for the use of facilities and services provided by the Government. In these cases, I am proposing changes in user charges for transportation so that different modes of transportation can compete on more equitable and efficient terms and users of special Government services will pay a greater share of the costs.

The estimated cost of completing the Interstate Highway System—which is financed by highway user taxes—has recently been increased by \$5.8 billion. To avoid serious delay in completing the system, while remaining on a pay-as-you-go basis, I will include in my excise tax proposals specific recommendations for increasing certain highway user charges.

In contrast to the users of the highways, the users of the airways and inland waterways bear considerably less than the full cost of the Government investments and services provided them. Accordingly, I am recommending increased or new taxes on aviation gasoline and jet fuels and a new tax on air freight for commercial aviation. Receipts from

the existing 2-cent tax on aviation gasoline should be kept in the general fund rather than transferred to the highway trust fund, and the 5-percent ticket tax on air passengers should be made permanent. A fuel tax for inland waterway users is also being proposed.

I will continue to press for other user charges in Government programs where benefits are provided to specific, identifiable individuals and businesses. Fairness to all taxpayers demands that those who enjoy special benefits should bear a greater share of the costs. Legislation is needed for some of the charges, such as patent and meat inspection fees. In other instances, equitable user charges will be instituted through administrative action.

I will also present recommendations to correct certain abuses in the tax-exempt privileges enjoyed by private foundations.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

This budget includes new obligational authority for 1966 of \$106.4 billion in the administrative budget.

Ninety-three billion five hundred million dollars of this requires congressional action this year.

Twelve billion nine hundred million dollars represents permanent authorizations that do not require further congressional action, mainly the appropriation for interest on the public debt.

Most of the \$34.5 billion in new obligational authority recommended for 1966 for trust funds represents revenues from special taxes which are automatically appropriated.

New obligational authority

(Fiscal years. In billions)

Description	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Total authorizations requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	\$87.9	\$94.5	\$93.5
Trust funds	.4	1.4	.5
Total authorizations not requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	13.2	12.8	12.9
Trust funds	31.2	30.3	34.0
Total new obligational authority:			
Administrative budget funds	101.1	107.3	106.4
Trust funds	31.5	31.8	34.5

The 1965 estimate in the administrative budget includes \$6.0 billion of recommended supplemental authorizations. These authorizations will provide funds for several programs for which I am requesting immediate consideration and enactment—for example, housing activities and aid to Appalachia. The new obligational authority and related expenditures under these supplemental proposals are reflected fully in the estimates presented in this budget.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

The soundness of a budget can only be judged by the merits of the programs it proposes and the levels of expenditure it recommends. For both old and new programs, merit turns on a weighing of benefits against costs. In constructing

this budget, I have tried to apply this approach to the entire range of Government operations.

Payments to the public

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Function	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Administrative budget expenditures:			
National defense	\$54.2	\$52.2	\$51.6
International affairs and finance	3.7	4.0	4.0
Of which food for peace	(1.7)	(1.7)	(1.7)
Space research and technology	4.2	4.9	5.1
Agriculture and agricultural resources (not including food for peace)	5.6	4.5	3.9
Natural resources	2.5	2.7	2.7
Commerce and transportation	3.0	3.4	2.8
Housing and community development	—1	—3	(1)
Health, labor, and welfare	5.5	6.2	8.3
Education	1.3	1.5	2.7
Veterans benefits and services	5.5	5.4	4.6
Interest	10.8	11.3	11.6
General government	2.3	2.4	2.5
Allowance for Appalachia	(1)	(1)	.1
Allowance for contingencies	—	.1	.4
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.7	.8	.6
Total administrative budget expenditures	97.7	97.5	99.7
Trust fund expenditures:			
Health, labor, and welfare	22.7	23.4	26.5
Commerce and transportation	3.5	3.9	3.7
National defense	.5	.8	1.0
Housing and community development	1.9	.2	.8
Veterans benefits and services	.7	.6	.5
All other	.1	.6	1.0
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.5	.6	.6
Total trust fund expenditures	28.9	29.0	32.9
Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments (deduct)	6.2	5.1	5.2
Total payments to the public	120.3	121.4	127.4

¹ Less than \$50,000,000.

As the year unfolds, developments may occur which call for prompt action by the Government. This is particularly true in international affairs, in the civil supersonic aircraft program, and in moving ahead with the recommendations resulting from various studies and analyses I am requesting, such as that related to military and civilian pay.

Specific legislation and appropriations to meet such contingencies will be proposed as needed, but the amounts which may be required cannot now be estimated with any confidence. The budget therefore includes an allowance for contingencies of \$650 million in new obligatory authority and \$400 million in expenditures. These amounts are larger than is customary. Their inclusion makes it clear that the budget totals are intended to provide adequately for meeting new needs that may arise or seizing new opportunities that may be presented. Here are the highlights of my expenditure recommendations:

National defense: We cannot afford second-best defense forces. Neither can we afford to be wasteful.

Our defense forces have reached new levels of strength. With the rapid strides made in the past 4 years and the

future gains already scheduled, our powerful modern forces will be adequate to their tasks for years to come. In cooperation with our allies, we have now provided for:

Forces able to deter nuclear attack.

Forces able to counter conventional aggression and prevent the piecemeal erosion of the free world.

Forces, in short, able to promote peace.

We still have improvements to make.

We must maintain a strong research and development program to insure that our forces are always the most modern in the world.

The 1966 budget fully provides for these needs.

However, we are able to reduce our defense expenditures in 1966 because:

The buildup of our forces, which started in 1961, is nearly complete.

The vigorous cost reduction program of the Department of Defense is producing large savings.

Less effective and less economical forces are being retired or reduced as promptly as possible.

International affairs and finance: We cannot achieve lasting world peace with armaments alone. Nor can greater worldwide prosperity be bought with money alone. These goals will be achieved only through the hard work, patience, understanding, and strength of men of good will everywhere.

Yet it is essential that we continue to put our best energies and some of our vast economic resources to work in solving the problems the world faces today. Prudent and careful expenditures for our international programs can help to keep men free, to promote understanding, and to substitute cooperation and negotiation for force in world affairs.

The 1966 budget calls for only a very modest increase in foreign economic assistance expenditures. With these funds, we will continue to concentrate our aid efforts in those less developed countries that are demonstrating the will and determination required to achieve political stability and economic growth.

We shall maintain our firm commitment to the Alliance for Progress—the focus of our efforts to achieve unity and understanding in this hemisphere. As an important part of this commitment, I recommend prompt action to permit our participation in the expansion of the Inter-American Development Bank.

This budget also enables us to:

Continue our participation in and support for the United Nations.

Maintain an adequate and alert network of diplomatic posts around the world.

Improve our oversea information activities, so that others may know us not just as a rich nation, but as a free and responsible nation as well.

Expand the Peace Corps, by now a proven experiment in international cooperation.

In an important step to strengthen the free world's financial system, the members of the International Monetary Fund are considering an increase in quotas. Upon completion of these discussions, expected shortly, I shall rec-

ommend that the Congress authorize promptly the funds needed to provide the U.S. share of this increase.

Space research and technology: This Nation has embarked on a bold program of space exploration and research which holds promise of rich rewards in many fields of American life. Our boldness is clearly indicated by the broad scope of our program and by our intent to send men to the moon within this decade.

The costs are high—as we knew they would be when we launched this effort. We have seen a rise in annual expenditures for the space program from less than one-half billion dollars in 1960 to over \$4 billion in 1964.

Expenditures are continuing to increase. However, we have built up momentum and are concentrating on our highest priority goals. Therefore, we will no longer need to increase space outlays by huge sums each year in order to meet our present objectives.

This budget proposes that expenditures increase by \$200 million in 1966 over 1965. This is the smallest annual increase since 1959. The new obligatory authority requested is about the same as enacted for 1965.

Agriculture and agricultural resources: The increased production efficiency of our farms has contributed greatly to growth of the national economy. This efficiency, in turn, has contributed, along with our high per capita income, to making us the best-fed Nation in the world, while men are leaving farms and entering other occupations.

However, because of lack of adequate employment opportunities, the rapidly declining need for people to operate our farms has also meant low incomes for all too many of our rural families. We must therefore find ways to help provide a greater share of our national prosperity for those rural families that do not farm or who can no longer look to farming as a sole source of income.

Progress toward this goal will be made both through broader programs to fight poverty and through programs specially aimed at increasing economic opportunities and improving living conditions for rural people. The latter include a proposal for an insured loan program which will help provide more and better housing in rural areas.

I shall shortly transmit to the Congress my recommendations to continue and improve our farm commodity programs.

For the longer run, we need to explore new approaches to the problems with which the farm commodity programs are designed to deal.

I have directed the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive review of the kinds of programs needed for the changing farm economy. I strongly believe that programs can be designed that will continue the national benefit from our present highly efficient commercial agriculture, bolster farm income, put less burden on the Federal budget, and direct more of our effort to the problems of low-income farmers.

Natural resources: During its last session, the Congress passed a number of far-reaching laws that will advance sig-

nificantly the development, conservation, and use of our natural resources. They include the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Wilderness Act, and the Water Resources Research Act. The 1966 budget will implement these measures.

The budget also recommends the start of 37 new projects by the Corps of Engineers, 9 new projects by the Bureau of Reclamation, and 5 new projects by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

About two-thirds of the total expenditures for natural resources will be used to continue construction and operation of projects to provide water, control floods, improve navigation, and generate power.

Increased attention has been focused in recent years on the importance of the wise use and conservation of our water resources. Federal investment in water and related resources development has grown sharply—and is expected to grow further in the period ahead.

Urban, industrial, and recreational requirements for water have increased greatly in recent years and will continue to increase as our economy grows. The relative priorities of many historic water uses, including cropland, are changing. The implications of the changing needs for water resources programs and the most effective means of achieving our objectives are under intensified review to meet changing priorities.

The budget provides for a major expansion in research to develop improved technology for desalting water, including the use of nuclear energy. This program holds important promise in a world where water is a key to economic development and well-being.

I am also again recommending legislation to authorize river basin planning commissions and grants to States for planning the best use of water resources.

Nuclear energy will become increasingly important in meeting the rapidly growing demand for electric power. Power reactors must be improved, however, to make better use of nuclear fuel resources than they do today, as well as to provide economical electricity. In 1966, the Atomic Energy Commission plans to join with non-Federal groups in the construction of two different advanced power reactors which incorporate substantial improvements over those now in use.

The Commission is also working toward the long-range objective of high-gain breeder reactors which produce significantly more fuel than they consume. These breeders would insure a tremendous energy source for centuries to come.

Commerce and transportation: The vitality of the millions of privately owned businesses is essential to our continued economic development. The Federal Government will continue to provide extensive encouragement toward this end.

In the depressed areas of our Nation, we must create a constructive partnership between industry and Government which will improve opportunities for new investment and new jobs.

I urge prompt congressional action to:

Extend the program begun by the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1965.

Amend the act so that Federal aids can be concentrated in areas of greatest need and can emphasize the most effective types of assistance.

If the Nation is to have a truly efficient system of transportation, we must revise the traditional Government programs of regulation and operating subsidies to place greater reliance upon the forces of free competition. My proposals for charging users of Government transportation services a greater share of the costs incurred on their behalf are consistent with this objective. In addition, my proposals for transportation will provide for greater emphasis on the recreational and scenic aspects of our road system.

To encourage long-overdue improvements in surface transportation in our densely populated regions, I will propose legislation to authorize a comprehensive program of technical research and development on high-speed, intercity surface transport. As a first step, we will begin demonstrations of possible improvements in existing rail passenger services in the northeast corridor of the Nation.

By increasing efficiency and productivity, the Post Office Department has been able to avoid a general increase in postal rates since calendar year 1962. Despite these efforts, however, significant postal deficits are now estimated in the current and future years. At my request, a panel of distinguished citizens will consider whether certain postal rates should be increased to bring them into line with postal costs.

Housing and community development: The Federal Government's role in the Nation's huge annual investment in housing and community development is largely indirect. The Government insures savings and loan accounts and mortgages, encouraging private investment and making large direct Federal investments unnecessary. Today these insurance programs are involved in about half of the homes purchased or being built.

Yet, some direct Federal aid is, and will remain, necessary. This type of aid gives incentives to forward-looking communities, lenders and builders, and private citizens, who share the national concern over the unsatisfactory state of American cities.

In a message on housing and urban development, I will present my proposals for further extension of the Federal-local-private partnership in meeting city problems. Revitalized Federal leadership through a new Department of Housing and Urban Development will be coupled with increased emphasis on comprehensive local planning.

Federal financial assistance will be offered to:

Support the neighborhood facilities needed to serve the city's people.

Increase the supply of low- and moderate-income housing.

Continue the attack on urban blight.

Encourage better standards of development and more adequate public facilities at the growing urban fringe.

No recent step in improving the prospects for future urban development has

been more significant than the enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. To extend similar opportunities to the local communities of the National Capital region, I urge authorization of the special Federal assistance required to provide the nucleus of an adequate system of high-speed urban transportation for this area.

Health, labor, and welfare: The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 rededicated the Nation to a vigorous attack on the causes of the poverty which grips one-fifth of our population—including 15 million children. Our objective is to mobilize local, State, and Federal resources in a coordinated effort to assist the poor—especially children and youth—to achieve a better life.

The 1966 budget provides for almost doubling the new obligational authority and quadrupling the expenditures for this effort. These funds will—

Support 300 urban and rural community action programs.

Provide work opportunities, remedial education, and vocational training for 330,000 youths in the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Provide work-study opportunities for 100,000 needy college students and work experience for 110,000 unemployed adults.

Support the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA); finance literacy training for adults; and assist migrant workers, farmers, and other low-income rural families.

To improve health care and facilities for the American people, the 1966 budget includes new proposals for:

Hospital insurance for the aged under social security.

Multipurpose regional medical centers to provide the most advanced diagnosis and treatment for heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.

Grants for operating expenses of medical and dental schools.

Initial staffing of community mental health centers.

Improved medical diagnostic and treatment services for preschool and school-age children and youth.

Grants for projects to reduce water pollution caused by combined storm and sanitary sewers.

Increased aid to State and local air and water pollution control agencies for research and for more vigorous enforcement.

Our social security system provides needed day-in and day-out support to the millions who have contributed to it during their working years. This system needs strengthening.

In addition to hospital insurance for the aged, I am proposing legislation to provide an average 7-percent increase in social security benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1965. The increase in benefit payments will amount to about \$2 billion in 1966.

I am proposing legislation to authorize long overdue improvements in the unemployment insurance system.

Improvements are also needed in our public assistance and manpower training programs.

Legislation will be recommended to increase the Federal share of public assistance payments, establish a program of medical care for children in families unable to afford such care, and authorize payments for needy aged persons in mental and tuberculosis hospitals.

Recommendations will also be made to broaden the Manpower Development and Training Act and increase the Federal share of project costs to 90 percent from the 66 percent which would go into effect under present law in 1966.

Education programs in the 1966 budget

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Agency or program	New obligational authority			Expenditures		
	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Office of Education:						
Elementary/secondary.....	\$407	\$488	\$1,765	\$404	\$408	\$971
Higher.....	164	668	1,167	150	182	496
Vocational and other.....	130	345	449	106	186	326
Subtotal, Office of Education.....	702	1,500	3,381	660	776	1,792
National Science Foundation.....	353	420	530	310	325	405
Other education programs.....	475	599	192	369	408	466
Total, education.....	1,530	2,519	4,103	1,339	1,509	2,663
Present programs.....	(1,530)	(2,519)	(2,588)	(1,339)	(1,509)	(2,063)
Proposed legislation.....			(1,515)			(600)

The 88th Congress enacted more education legislation than any previous Congress. About 30 percent of the estimated increase in expenditures for education in 1966 is to carry out the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, and the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964.

But much remains to be done. Federal aid to meet critical needs in elementary and secondary education has not been enacted. Such aid is vital if we are to end the situation in which children are handicapped for life because they happen to live in communities which cannot support good schools.

The program I am proposing emphasizes assistance to improve elementary and secondary education, particularly for children who live in poverty. It will step up research in education and help schools and communities to provide wider educational opportunities for all. It will also strengthen higher education by expanding assistance to colleges and to college students. My proposals were presented more fully in a special message on education.

I also propose to expand present programs of support for academic research and science education. In 1966, expenditures by the National Science Foundation will increase by 25 percent, primarily to help provide an adequate rate of growth in Federal support for basic research in universities. Consistent with these objectives, I recommend that the Congress remove its restrictions on payments to universities for indirect costs of research grants.

Veterans benefits and services: Veterans benefits and services under the basic, continuing compensation, pension, and

Education: Among the unfinished tasks of our Nation, the improvement of education deserves first priority.

It is our primary weapon in the war on poverty and the principal tool for building a Great Society.

This budget recognizes the increasing Federal responsibility to expand educational opportunity for all people and at all levels. It provides an increase in 1966 of over 60 percent in new obligational authority and over 75 percent in outlays. The programs of the Office of Education alone are more than doubled in 1966.

medical care programs will be at record levels in 1966.

Nearly 4½ million veterans or their survivors will receive compensation and pension payments.

Six hundred and ninety thousand veterans will be admitted to hospitals, domiciliary homes, or nursing homes.

Legislation enacted in 1964 by the 88th Congress to increase pension rates and to establish new nursing home programs will entail expenditures in 1966 of more than \$100 million.

In line with the trend of recent years, an increasing part of the expenditures for veterans will be for non-service-connected benefits and services. As we continue to improve our social security and health protection programs, we should place greater reliance on these programs for meeting veterans needs not connected with their military service. Our major emphasis in veterans programs should be concentrated on meeting fully our obligation to those who were disabled in the defense of the country and to their dependents and survivors.

The Appalachian region: The Appalachian region of the United States has not shared fully in the great growth and prosperity enjoyed by the Nation as a whole. The 16 million people of this 165,000-square-mile area deserve a better opportunity to improve their region.

Many of the education, health, housing, and economic opportunity programs already outlined in the budget will help to overcome the problems brought on by chronic poverty. We need to make the most effective use of these programs. But a special effort is required to help this region. This means that Federal, State, local, and private institutions must combine to—

Improve access to the region.

Develop its natural resources.

Promote better employment opportunities for its people.

I urge the enactment of legislation to make this possible.

Employee pay: In preparing this budget, I have given close attention to the matter of Government pay.

Federal pay raises in the past 3 years have moved us much nearer to realizing the principle that civilian pay rates should be comparable to those in private enterprise for the same levels of work and that changes in pay and allowances of members of the uniformed forces should keep pace with advances in the general economy. These policies have been firmly established after careful congressional review. Taken together, they assure that civilian and military pay are effectively interrelated and maintained at rates which are fair to taxpayers and to Federal employees.

I believe, however, that it is equally essential to assure that any proposals for further pay adjustments during this calendar year accurately reflect pay developments in the private economy and be compatible with our national wage and price objectives.

For these reasons, I am appointing a special panel to make a prompt review of the present situation. This panel will be composed equally of distinguished public members and officers of the executive branch. It will report to me on April 1, 1965, after which I will make a recommendation to the Congress. Provision has been made in the allowance for contingencies for a possible military and civilian pay increase.

PUBLIC DEBT

Changes in the amount of public debt from year to year reflect primarily the amount of the budget surplus or deficit. Based on the estimates presented in this budget, the debt on June 30, 1965, will be \$316.9 billion and on June 30, 1966, \$322.5 billion.

Public debt at end of year

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1963 actual	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Owned by Federal agencies and trust funds.....	\$57.9	\$60.7	\$62.5	\$64.4
Owned privately and by Federal Reserve banks.....	248.6	251.8	254.4	258.1
Total.....	306.5	312.5	316.9	322.5

NOTE.—For further details see table 11 in pt. 2 of this document.

Under present law, the temporary debt limit of \$324 billion will continue in effect through June 30, 1965. Then—if no action is taken—the permanent legislative ceiling of \$285 billion will again become effective. It will be necessary, therefore, to raise the legal debt ceiling before that date.

The size of the debt limit needed is strongly affected by the seasonal pattern of Federal receipts and expenditures. Since receipts are always larger in the last half of the fiscal year, the public debt during 1966 will, from time to time, exceed the level presently estimated for June 30, 1966.

These seasonal fluctuations will require a higher debt limit than would be necessary if we had only to consider the amount of debt at the end of the fiscal year.

The need for flexibility in managing the debt must also be considered in fixing the debt limit. The Treasury generally borrows relatively large amounts of cash at periodic intervals during the year. These sizable financing operations are—and should be—carefully timed to take full advantage of favorable market conditions when they exist.

REDUCING GOVERNMENT COSTS

As we focus attention on improving the quality of American life, we must also see to the quality of American Government.

The tasks we face are formidable. They require new dedication, new vision, and new skills. We have neither the resources nor the right to saddle our people with unproductive and inefficient Government organization, services, or practices.

This must be a year of renewal—a year that will be long remembered for what we accomplish in bringing the public service to its highest state of readiness.

To realize this renewal, action will be necessary on a wide front. I pledge that this administration will strive to conduct the work of the Government by the same exacting standards that would apply in the most expertly managed private business.

Government organization: We must reorganize and modernize the structure of the executive branch in order to focus responsibilities and increase efficiency. I will shortly propose certain reorganizations which will constitute the initial and most urgent steps that I deem necessary to consolidate functions and strengthen coordination of related activities.

I will ask that permanent reorganization authority be granted to the President to initiate improvements in Government organization, subject to the disapproval of the Congress.

Controlling employment: In this budget, as in the budget for 1965, I have insisted upon stringent criteria to control the growth of Federal civilian employment. It is important that we have enough people to carry on the Government's business efficiently, but we must also see that we have no more employees than we need.

Realistic guidelines and goals have been established to aid administrators in the effective management of the Government's large and diverse work force. Controls on employment have been established for each agency. To remove the guesswork from determination of employment needs, agencies are installing improved work measurement systems, and the Bureau of the Budget is providing advice and assistance in introducing measures of productivity into agency management systems. The result of such efforts has been and will continue to be a reduction in the size of the Federal work force relative to the work being accomplished. The effectiveness of these controls may be seen in the fact that had Federal civilian employment

kept its 1955 relationship to total population, Federal employees would have totaled 2,747,000 on June 30, 1964, more than 275,000 above the actual number as of that date.

Modest and highly selective increases in employment are proposed in the budget for 1966, mainly to carry out new and expanded programs recommended in this budget and to reduce excessive overtime in the Post Office Department. At the same time, we will take full advantage of every opportunity to keep the work force at minimum levels by eliminating functions, consolidating operations, closing unnecessary offices and installations, and abolishing vacancies. Total civilian employment proposed for 1966 is about 1 percent above the totals for the current year, and I am confident that we will be able to keep actual employment somewhat below these estimates.

Management improvement and cost reduction: The past year has been a successful one from the standpoint of improved management and cost reduction. Next year will be still better.

Led by the outstanding performance of the Department of Defense, Government agencies last year undertook cost reductions that saved almost \$3.5 billion. These economies were not easy to come by. They have resulted from the concentrated work of Government officials and employees in all agencies, large and small. They reflect a wide variety of actions ranging from the abolition of reports and other publications to the introduction of computers, the application of modern business equipment, the adoption of new purchasing methods, and decisions to close major installations.

I am counting heavily on the continuation and acceleration of cost reduction and management improvement efforts. Every dollar saved in this way can be put to better use in carrying on more urgent business. And today every dollar is important. Among other things, we must:

Continue our war on excessive paperwork.

Increase our capacity to find and correct management weaknesses throughout the Government.

Reexamine our career services, making certain that they are all they should be with respect to selection, training, placement, promotion, rotation, retirement, and removal.

Seek legislation that will remove legal barriers to efficient operation.

I have instructed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to give direction to a comprehensive, Government-wide cost reduction program to be put into effect in every department and agency. In general, this program will require the head of each agency to:

Take personal charge of cost reduction efforts.

Set specific goals for reductions in cost. Reassess priorities for all programs and operations.

Identify and remove roadblocks to economy.

Verify reported savings.

I believe the Congress and the American people approve my goals of economy and efficiency. I believe they are as

opposed to waste as I am. We can and will eliminate it.

CONCLUSION

Since I sent you my first budget a year ago—

Four million Americans have been born.

Three million two hundred thousand young people have reached college age.

One million seven hundred thousand new families have been formed.

One million three hundred thousand persons have entered the labor force.

One million five hundred thousand persons have reached retirement age.

Thus, our Nation faces growing responsibilities. But we also possess growing resources to meet them.

One result of our expanding economy is a larger revenue potential. This means a potential for—

Necessary increases in Federal expenditures.

Reductions in taxes.

Reductions in the public debt.

No one of these goals is paramount at all times. Each must be balanced against the others to assure our continued progress toward a Great Society.

This progress does not rest on economic growth alone. It is aimed at improving the quality of our way of life. And it is aimed at insuring that all Americans share in this way of life.

The Federal Government must do its part.

This does not mean simply spending more.

It does mean spending more on some new and vital activities. But it also means cutting back or eliminating activities which are less urgent or no longer necessary.

Where there is waste, to end it; where there are needs, to meet them; where there are just hopes, to move toward their fulfillment—that is the object of the budget which I now submit to your consideration.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 25, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include tabular material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the President's budget for fiscal year 1966. It is very voluminous. A great portion of our time in the coming weeks and months will be devoted to the study of this budget and to the consideration in the House of the appropriation bills for various Government operations for the fiscal year 1966.

Last year, the Committee on Appropriations improved its image, to employ a much used word, considerably, in the Congress and in the country, by expeditiously considering and passing all appropriation bills in the House by July 1.

We begin our hearings on the fiscal year 1966 budget on Thursday of this week before the full Committee on Appropriations. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget will be the first witnesses. We expect to very soon develop a schedule for the consideration of the appropriation bills that will be acceptable to the Speaker, the majority leader, and to the minority leader.

I should like to make a brief statement and in connection with the revision of my remarks insert considerably more material which I think pertinent to the budget situation.

It is, of course, impossible to evaluate fully the President's budget without a thorough study, but my overall reaction to today's budget is largely favorable. In my judgment, there is much about this budget that the country and both sides of the political aisle can and will accept. Unquestionably there will be unanimity about the great bulk of it. Undoubtedly there will be controversy over certain specific items.

I am immediately struck with the fact that this is a performance budget in the sense that it manifests a determination by the President to deliver what he has promised the country.

I personally know that the President and his associates have labored mightily to hold spending at the lowest acceptable level in many areas of government. This has been a herculean task. No more sincere and dedicated job in this respect, has ever been done by the executive branch in my memory. I want to commend the President and the members of his Cabinet and the heads of the agencies for their efforts. Some priorities have been reset and some non-essential and low-priority items have been weeded out.

There is no doubt but that many hard decisions have been made. Some of the decisions are unpopular and painful, but they demonstrate a determined effort to activate the President's objectives. Certain of these decisions have been painful, in some cases to you and in some cases to me, but we all want to see this Government managed in the best possible way.

From the standpoint of good management, the President's budget is more outstanding than any of those with which I have had to deal in my service here.

The budget inevitably grows as a growing population makes automatic demands for more public services, but I note approvingly the restraint manifested by the fact that today's budget, as a percentage of the gross national product, is the smallest in 15 years. This, I think, is further evidence of the indefatigable labors of the President and those who have worked with him in this tremendous task.

I am sure that I will not find myself in agreement with every recommendation and I would not expect the Congress to be in full agreement with all the items in the budget. My colleagues, we have our independent legislative responsibilities and I propose that we must discharge them. We need a strong

President and we need a strong Congress, but we also need a degree of cooperation between them which will enable this country to move forward.

A thorough evaluation of all budget proposals by the Congress is imperative and in keeping with our responsibility to the taxpayers back home.

As the President indicated in his inaugural address, we can have progress and still have some differences of opinion. Generally speaking, I believe it is best that we be in a perpetual state of some dissatisfaction about Government spending but with our perspectives in good focus.

We will give full and complete consideration to all phases of the appropriations budget in the 50-member Committee on Appropriations. If we are to have a reasonably early adjournment, we must move along expeditiously and we propose to do that.

Pursuant to leave granted, Mr. Speaker, I shall now supplement my preliminary remarks on the new budget with some additional material which I hope may be useful in the consideration of the budget. Manifestly, we cannot digest immediately the fullness of anything so encompassing, so vast, and complex as the budget for the far-flung operations of the U.S. Government.

SOME PERSPECTIVES ABOUT DIMENSIONS OF FEDERAL SPENDING

As I mentioned earlier, a distinguishing feature of today's budget is that it proposes spending a smaller proportion of the GNP—gross national product—than is the case this year or last year—in fact, the smallest in 15 years. In all administrations, budgets rest on a mix of philosophy and fact. It is inevitable that we face big national budgets as long as we face the totalitarian challenge to freedom. There can be no limits to the necessities because there is no second place in the contest. But beyond defense spending, growth of the country and the economy and growth of the budget are to an extent inseparably bound up together. Increased governmental spending virtually adds a third dimension to the law of inevitability. It is of interest to note that through both Republican and Democratic administrations in the last 10 or 12 years the spending budget, while climbing, has ranged around 16 percent of the gross national product—GNP, a widely accepted overall measure. Growth of the population means growth of demand for public services. I recall what President Eisenhower had to say on this general point in his 1960 budget to Congress:

Inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of the Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years. We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities.

This is such a fundamental point of consideration to a good perspective about big budgets that I should take the time to quote one of our predecessors who was once chairman of the House Committee

on Appropriations and later President—James A. Garfield, from the great State of my friend, the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. Writing about national appropriations and expenses way back in 1879, Mr. Garfield put the question this way:

What, then, is the test by which the proper scale of national expenditures shall be determined? In time of peace, perhaps the most important test is that of population. Doubtless the annual increase of national expenditures should bear some relation to the increase of population; but it would be unphilosophical, in the highest degree, to insist that expenditures shall increase in the same ratio as the population increases. * * * Judged by the test of population alone, the total ordinary expenditures of a growing nation ought to increase year by year; but the amount expended per capita ought not to increase but should rather diminish.

From these elements, the just scale of increase could be readily ascertained, if all our calculations could rest upon the basis of perpetual peace; but war—

And today I think he would add "cold war"—

but war * * * overturns all ordinary calculations. * * * For more than half of all expenditures of civilized nations have been devoted to war and the support of armies and navies.

I was especially struck by Mr. Garfield's depth of perspective and by the applicability of his statement to the current budget situation.

National defense alone—the "cold war," if one pleases—now takes about 52 cents of each administrative budget dollar.

Interest on the debt, very largely accumulated during hot wars, takes about 12 cents of each budget dollar. There are other war- or defense-related expenses but these two categories alone make big budgets an inescapable fact of life.

To bring these big and increasing budgets in a bit sharper focus, I would mention right here just one other fact that I noted some time ago. It is rather arresting. About three-quarters—75 percent—of Federal budget spending today goes for things considered proper functions of the Federal Government from the early days of the Republic—national defense, internal revenue, the postal service, administration of justice, aid to veterans, conduct of foreign affairs, and interest on the national debt.

Perspective is not always easy to come by. All of us more or less have our philosophies, our interests, our ideas. We are always more enlightened by an intelligent conflict of opinions than we are by too much agreement, because out of divergence and contention comes the distilled view, the majority rule which is the distinguishing feature of our form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I would also recall something which Abraham Lincoln said while serving here in the House:

There are few things wholly evil or wholly good. Almost everything, especially of governmental policy, is an inseparable compound of the two; so that our best judgment

of the preponderance between them is continually demanded.

It seems to me therefore that as we process the many segments of this budget—both sides, all sides of it—all of us here in Congress might well “continually demand” what seems to us best for our free democratic way of life. Congress has its responsibilities to the people to thoroughly ventilate, debate, and decide the issues. Thorough consideration and vigorous debate are conducive to better legislation and better government. Democracy, like people, gains strength from exercise. And as a general proposition of principle I would say that we shall be in deep trouble if that day ever comes when all of us are satisfied with a given level of public spending, at whatever level.

Mr. Speaker, a source of some misunderstanding and confusion in the House, in the press, and therefore in the coun-

try is the matter of just which budget we act upon. Contrary to widespread impression, the House will not act directly on the more generally familiar \$99.7 billion spending budget for fiscal 1966. The House acts on the new obligational authority budget of \$106.4 billion for 1966, the fiscal year which begins on July 1, 1965, and extends through June 30, 1966. That is the amount for fiscal 1966, not the \$99.7 billion spending budget. There will be in addition, in this session, about \$6 billion of new obligational supplementals for the current fiscal year 1965. The grant of authority to obligate is the significant point of decision in the process. The actual expenditure in payment of the obligation necessarily follows in due time. If no obligation is created, then no expenditure—disbursement—is made. The \$99.7 billion spending budget for 1966 is the checking account budget—it represents

the checks to be drawn to pay the bills. The \$106.4 billion is the authority to create the obligation and that is the key figure to keep in mind because that is the basis on which the bills to be voted on will be stated. An increasingly higher obligational authority budget signifies, inevitably as night follows day, a higher future spending.

It should be noted that the House at this session will have opportunity to vote on only approximately \$59.1 billion of the \$99.7 billion spending budget figure for fiscal 1966. The point is that much of the \$99.7 billion has been approved by previous Congresses. And about \$12.9 billion of the \$106.4 new obligational authority budget represents permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law and therefore not required to be voted on in the current session. I will insert a table that elucidates the situation:

The 1966 spending and new obligational budgets—Portions subject to action in this session

	Administrative budget estimate of expenditures, 1966 (disbursements)	Administrative budget requests for new obligational authority, 1966
1. Totals proposed, President's budget, Jan. 25, 1965.....	\$99,687,000,000	\$106,417,000,000
2. Deduct estimate of expenditures in fiscal 1966 against obligational authority made available in prior sessions (and therefore not before the present session for action).....	-27,640,000,000	
Subtotal.....	72,047,000,000	106,417,000,000
3. Deduct amounts applicable to permanent appropriations recurring automatically without necessity for action in this session (several items; interest is by far the largest. Expenditure figure here may negligibly duplicate some small part of item 2, but not enough to distort).....	-12,909,000,000	-12,909,000,000
Amount involved in proposals for direct consideration and action in this session.....	59,138,000,000	93,508,000,000
4. Foregoing divided as to—		
(a) Amounts relating to proposed new legislation, first to be considered by various legislative committees prior to any appropriation action.....	416,960,000	2,548,654,000
(b) All other amounts (going programs, but this includes major military procurement and R. & D.; military construction; NASA; AEC; Peace Corps; foreign assistance; and the Coast Guard; all of which, aggregating some \$28,974,000,000, must be processed twice, first in annual authorization bills from the legislative committees and therefore subject to some budgetary impact before appropriation action).....	58,721,040,000	90,959,346,000

NOTES

Item 2, in the “expenditure” figure, would include some amounts applicable to activities subject to annual scrutiny under the Corporation Control Act which would largely result, however, from new obligational authority granted in previous sessions. Item 3, the “expenditure” figure is a bit arbitrary because a few relatively small items cannot be separately identified.

In addition, 1966 budget indicates proposed supplementals this session for fiscal 1965—tentatively, \$5,978,000,000 in new obligational authority (of which, again tentatively, \$1,460,000,000 is estimated to be expended in fiscal 1965, the balance in later years).

NEW LEGISLATIVE PROPOSITIONS WITH BUDGET AMOUNTS

Mr. Speaker, the first-year costs of the President's new legislative propositions are included in the budget in terms of both new obligational authority and expenditures. These are in the class of items which must twice run the gant-

let, so to speak, if they are to be undertaken. First, in sundry bills from the various legislative committees, prior to appropriation consideration, the proposals will either be enacted or, if such be the decision, be cut from the budget by failure of enactment.

New legislation, of course, is a principal source of seed for higher future budgets. The first-year cost is often comparatively small.

For general information and reference, I include a table summarizing the official budget totals on this point:

Propositions of new legislation included in the budget for 1966 (for both fiscal years 1965 and 1966)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 budget		1966 budget	
	New obligational authority requested	Expenditures (estimated)	New obligational authority requested	Expenditures (estimated)
Funds appropriated to the President:				
Inter-American Development Bank.....	250,000		250,000	25,000
International Monetary Fund.....	1,031,250	287,812		
Agriculture:				
REA: Revolving fund.....		-168,000	-345,000	-177,000
FHA: Insured rural housing program, increase in insured rural housing loans.....			100,000	40,000
ARS: Meat inspection, user fees.....			-27,308	-31,945
AMS: Poultry, grain, cotton, tobacco, etc., user fees.....			-20,938	-24,646
SCS: Fees for technical services.....			-20,000	-20,000
Total, Agriculture.....		(-168,000)	(-313,241)	(-213,591)

Propositions of new legislation included in the budget for 1966 (for both fiscal years 1965 and 1966)—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 budget		1966 budget	
	New obligational authority requested	Expenditures (estimated)	New obligational authority requested	Expenditures (estimated)
Commerce:				
A.R.A.			400,000	40,000
Transportation research, Northeast corridor, tests and evaluation			20,000	10,000
Total, Commerce			(420,000)	(50,000)
Defense—Civil: Ryukyu Islands, Ryukyuan pretreaty claims			22,000	15,000
Health, Education, and Welfare:				
Medical care for children under public assistance			100,000	100,000
Grants for maternal and child welfare			25,000	25,000
Vocational rehabilitation, amendments for services to mentally retarded and severely disabled			10,000	7,000
Community health facilities, services and education			106,000	58,000
Mental retardation development grants			(2,200)	(2,200)
Multipurpose medical centers			(50,000)	(10,000)
Community mental health centers, initial staffing			(19,500)	(19,500)
Operating support grants to medical and dental schools			(20,000)	(20,000)
Group practice facilities (loans and guaranteed loans)			(7,500)	(3,100)
University research and training, HEW-wide authority for grants for specialized facilities			(7,000)	(3,000)
Elementary and secondary education			1,255,000	500,000
Higher education, including student assistance and other			280,000	100,000
Environmental health			60,000	12,000
Construction and research grants to solve storm and sanitary sewer problem			(50,000)	(5,000)
Increase various grant ceilings, etc., for enforcement, control, and construction in air- and water-pollution programs			(10,000)	(7,000)
Social security, military service credits			60,000	60,000
Public assistance, increase public assistance payments			114,000	114,000
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare			(1,990,000)	(976,000)
Interior:				
Bonneville power revolving fund			-80,030	-80,030
Southeastern power revolving fund			-1,000	-25,200
Southwestern power revolving fund			-10,300	-18,369
Total, Interior			(-91,330)	(-123,599)
Labor: Manpower Development and Training Act, to reduce matching requirements for States and other amendments			140,500	40,000
Post Office: Authorize Federal construction of postal facilities			92,154	18,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency:				
Federal National Mortgage Association: Special assistance functions (authorization to spend debt receipts)	150,000			5,000
Urban service facilities and basic community facility grants			150,000	15,000
College housing loans (authorization to spend debt receipts)	110,000			
Urban renewal fund (contract authorization)	675,000			
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	(935,000)		(150,000)	(20,000)
Veterans' Administration: Compensation and pensions, check cycling				-150,000
Farm Credit Administration: Short-term credit investment fund				-7,500
National Capital Transportation Agency: Federal grant for construction of District of Columbia subway			10,171	1,550
Small Business Administration: Sale of participations in pool of business loans			-137,000	-350,000
District of Columbia:				
Federal payment increase			7,000	7,000
Increase highway fund loan authorization			2,700	2,100
Increase loan for District of Columbia subway			5,700	
Total, District of Columbia			(15,400)	(9,100)
Appalachia: (Several agencies)	365,000	3,000		107,000
Total, proposed legislation, for 1965 and 1966 in the 1966 Budget	2,581,250	92,812	2,548,654	416,960

1966 budget, trust funds, proposed legislation

[In thousands of dollars]

	1966	
	New obligational authority requested	Trust expenditures estimated
Agriculture: For voluntary inspection of tobacco and grain and classing of cotton	7,546	7,229
Proposed improvements in the social security system increasing benefits (expenditures) to be financed by increases in the covered wage base and tax rate (receipts and NOA):		
Old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	-332,000	1,858,000
Federal disability insurance trust fund	194,000	155,000
Railroad retirement account	3,600	42,000
Hospital insurance for the aged—provides hospital care under the social security system	600,000	20,000
Military service credits:		
Old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	56,000	
Disability insurance trust fund	4,000	
District of Columbia: Construction of mass transportation system	5,700	
Total, trust funds	538,846	2,082,229

VARIATIONS IN BUDGET PROJECTIONS

Mr. Speaker, it is always prudent to keep in mind as we consider segments of the budget during the session, that original budget totals are tentative at best. They never turn out to be exact. The final results are always at variance—and

for a variety of reasons. It is not unnatural; it is understandable; and it is traditional that a budget, which defines sets of goals, charts courses of actions, and outlines expectations, should be somewhat optimistic in outlook and tone. It embodies anticipations. This is true in all national budgets and in all admin-

istrations. But it is unfortunately nonetheless true that the realizations often do not measure to the initial expectations. More often than not there has been a shortfall. I will insert a rather illuminating tabulation for the 10 years, 1955-64, which cuts across administrations of both political parties:

Variations in administrative budgets—The original versus the final (using the last 10 budgets, 1955-64)

[Rounded amounts used]

Receipts:		Surplus (+) or deficit (-):	
Original January budget projections.....	\$760,300,000,000	Original January budget projections.....	-\$8,300,000,000
Final results (when the years were over).....	747,900,000,000	Final results.....	-39,500,000,000
Revenues fell short by.....	-12,400,000,000	So, in total, instead of a deficit of \$8,300,000,000 over the 10 years as originally projected, there was a deficit of \$39,500,000,000, a change for the worse of.....	
NOTE.—In 6 of the 10 years, revenues were less than the original budget; 4 were more.		31,200,000,000	
Expenditures:		New obligational authority:	
Original January budget projections.....	768,600,000,000	Original January budget proposals from the President (which he not infrequently amends from time to time).....	771,300,000,000
Final results.....	787,400,000,000	Final amounts enacted.....	810,800,000,000
Expenditures went higher by.....	+18,800,000,000	Final amounts enacted exceeded the original budget proposals by.....	
NOTE.—In 6 of the 10 years, actual spending exceeded the original budget. In 4 years, it was less.		39,500,000,000	
So, in total, there was a deviation of.....	31,200,000,000	NOTE.—In 9 of the 10 years the final amount enacted exceeded the original January budget proposal for the year.	

Source: Budget documents.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

Mr. Speaker, further in connection with the fact that the House will act on the new obligational authority budget

rather than the expenditure budget and that a higher obligational budget fore-ordains a higher spending budget, I include a table of obligational authority for each year since the end of the

Korean war. It shows the trends of what Congress has been enacting—for both national defense and nondefense functions:

New obligational authority—Defense and nondefense

[Administrative budget basis. Rounded amounts used]

Fiscal year	National defense functions	Other than national defense	Total new obligational authority
1953 enacted (Korean war year).....	\$57,298,000,000	\$23,010,000,000	\$80,308,000,000
1954 enacted (1st post-Korean year).....	39,471,000,000	23,294,000,000	62,765,000,000
1955 enacted.....	33,656,000,000	23,420,000,000	57,076,000,000
1956 enacted.....	35,903,000,000	27,295,000,000	63,198,000,000
1957 enacted.....	41,344,000,000	28,835,000,000	70,179,000,000
1958 enacted.....	40,448,000,000	35,897,000,000	76,345,000,000
1959 enacted.....	45,517,000,000	35,845,000,000	81,365,000,000
1960 enacted.....	44,761,000,000	34,813,000,000	79,574,000,000
1961 enacted.....	45,994,000,000	40,681,000,000	86,675,000,000
Increase in level in 8 years, 1961 over 1954.....	+6,523,000,000	+17,387,000,000	+23,910,000,000
1962 enacted.....	52,414,000,000	40,448,000,000	92,862,000,000
1963 enacted.....	54,323,000,000	47,960,000,000	102,283,000,000
1964 enacted.....	53,762,000,000	47,341,000,000	101,103,000,000
1965 enacted plus supplementals to come (as shown in 1966 budget).....	52,424,000,000	54,838,000,000	107,262,000,000
1966 total proposed (as shown in 1966 budget).....	51,129,000,000	55,288,000,000	106,417,000,000
Comparisons:			
1966 total proposed compared to 1965 including proposed 1965 supplementals.....	-1,295,000,000	+450,000,000	-845,000,000
1966 compared to 1964 enacted.....	-2,633,000,000	+7,947,000,000	+5,314,000,000

¹ Includes \$5,978,000,000 proposed as supplementals for 1965 in 1966 budget.² Includes \$3,205,000,000 for transmission later in session, mostly all entailing propositions of new legislation.

Source: Budget increments, including the budget for 1966.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING AND THE BUDGET RESULTS

Debate on the direction and growth of the Federal budget in recent years has centered to some extent on the relative proportions allocated between national defense and nondefense functions. The impression has been fairly widespread that defense spending has principally accounted for the rather rapid rise in Federal spending. But this is not the case. By far the greater increase, in both absolute dollars and percentage-wise, has been in the nondefense areas rather than national defense

although—and this is worthy of note—in the last 4 or 5 years the proportion between the two has been somewhat more nearly even. I think we might usefully bring the picture on that down to date.

It would, I think, be fair to start with fiscal 1954. The Korean war had just concluded. During the following years through fiscal 1961, which ended June 30, 1961, the level of national defense spending stood virtually still. Nondefense spending rose rather steadily. The official budget expenditure figures—I am using expenditures rather than appro-

priations—show that national defense spending rose only 1 percent from fiscal 1954 through fiscal 1961, whereas nondefense spending increased 65 percent in that period.

The buildup following the Berlin crisis in 1961, the subsequent emphasis on conventional and limited war capability, and the acceleration of the buildup of our intercontinental ballistic missile force, resulted in larger appropriations for defense in the years 1961-65 and brought about a more nearly balanced proportion of increased spending as

between defense and nondefense functions. The substantial completion of these buildups, and a renewed emphasis on domestic programs, indicates some alteration in these ratios as indicated in the following table:

Net budget receipts and net budget expenditures (the traditional administrative budget), fiscal years 1954-66

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Net budget receipts	Net budget expenditures			Budget surplus (+) or deficit (-)
		National defense	Other than national defense	Total	
Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year).....	\$64,671	\$50,442	\$23,678	\$74,120	-\$9,449
Fiscal 1954 (1st post-Korea year).....	64,420	46,986	20,551	67,537	-3,117
Fiscal 1955.....	60,209	40,695	23,694	64,389	-4,180
Fiscal 1956.....	67,850	40,723	25,501	66,224	+1,626
Fiscal 1957.....	70,562	43,360	25,606	68,966	+1,596
Fiscal 1958.....	68,550	44,234	27,135	71,369	-2,819
Fiscal 1959.....	67,915	46,491	33,851	80,342	-12,427
Fiscal 1960.....	77,763	45,691	30,848	76,539	+1,224
Fiscal 1961.....	77,659	47,494	34,021	81,515	-3,856
8 years, 1954-61.....	554,928	355,674	221,207	576,881	-21,953
Fiscal 1962.....	81,409	51,103	36,684	87,787	-6,378
Fiscal 1963.....	86,376	52,755	39,887	92,642	-6,266
Fiscal 1964.....	89,459	54,182	43,502	97,684	-8,226
Fiscal 1965 (as reestimated in 1966 budget).....	91,200	52,160	45,321	97,481	-6,281
4 years, 1962-1965, with 1965 still an estimate.....	348,444	210,200	165,394	375,594	-27,151
Fiscal 1966 (the budget estimate, January 1965).....	94,400	51,578	48,109	99,687	-5,287
Comparisons:					
Fiscal 1966 compared to 1964 actual.....	+4,941	-2,604	+4,607	+2,003	-2,939
Fiscal 1966 compared to current reestimate for 1965.....	+3,200	-582	+2,788	+2,206	-994

¹ As with all budgets, rests on many assumptions and contingencies. Principal assumptions underlying the revenue figure: calendar 1965 GNP of \$660,000,000,000 (up from \$622,300,000,000 in 1964); personal income of \$520,000,000,000 (up from \$491,400,000,000 in 1964); corporate profits before taxes, \$61,000,000,000 (up from \$57,200,000,000 in 1964). Also assumes various legislation for cutting excises effective July 1, 1965, and enacting various user charges—see pp. 52-55 of budget.

² As with all budgets, rests to some extent on various proposed new legislation, having the effect of either some expenditure reductions or some increases.

Source: Budget documents, including the 1966 budget of Jan. 25, 1965.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

A word about the matter of the debt. The bulk of our steadily rising public debt was incurred in World War II, but not all of it. The debt necessarily increases as money is borrowed from the

future to pay for some of our current costs. The record of national self-discipline and restraint in this respect over the last 35 years is something less than ideal in the minds of many people. It

will be necessary in this session to again make another upward adjustment in the \$324 billion debt ceiling.

I include a recent Treasury statistical table on the Federal debt:

Summary of direct and guaranteed debt on significant dates

[Based upon statement of the public debt published monthly; consequently all figures are stated as of the end of a month]

Date	Classification	Total debt (including interest-bearing debt, matured debt on which interest has ceased, and debt bearing no interest)			
		Direct debt (gross)	Guaranteed debt ^{1 2}	Total direct and guaranteed debt	Per capita ³
WORLD WAR I					
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt.....	\$1,282,044,346.28	-----	\$1,282,044,346.28	\$12.36
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt.....	26,596,701,648.01	-----	26,596,701,648.01	250.18
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt.....	16,026,087,087.07	-----	16,026,087,087.07	129.66
WORLD WAR II					
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program.....	42,967,531,037.68	⁴ \$5,529,070,655.28	⁴ 48,496,601,692.96	367.08
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt.....	55,039,819,926.98	6,324,048,005.28	61,363,867,932.26	458.47
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt.....	279,213,558,897.10	550,810,451.19	279,764,369,348.29	1,989.75
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased.....	269,422,099,173.26	476,384,859.30	269,898,484,032.56	1,908.79
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt ⁵	251,530,468,254.82	22,851,485.16	251,553,319,739.98	1,690.29
SINCE KOREA					
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950).....	257,357,352,351.04	19,503,033.97	257,376,855,385.01	1,696.74
Dec. 31, 1952	267,391,155,979.65	53,969,565.31	267,445,125,544.96	1,687.90
Nov. 30, 1964	Highest debt ⁶	318,436,290,312.18	833,751,225.00	319,320,041,537.18	⁷ 1,654.18
Dec. 31, 1963	Debt a year ago.....	309,346,845,059.17	741,796,725.00	310,088,641,784.17	⁷ 1,625.13
Nov. 30, 1964	Debt last month.....	318,436,290,312.18	833,751,225.00	319,320,041,537.18	⁷ 1,654.18
Dec. 31, 1964	Debt this month.....	317,940,472,718.38	809,241,900.00	318,749,714,618.38	⁷ 1,647.70

¹ Does not include securities owned by the Treasury.

² Includes outstanding matured principal of guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies for which cash to make payment is held by the Treasury of the United States in the general fund balance.

³ Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.

⁴ Revised.

⁵ Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)..... \$251,245,889,059.02
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies..... 23,876,001.12

Total direct and guaranteed debt..... 251,269,765,060.14

⁶ Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was on Dec. 30, 1964, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)..... \$318,979,836,156.27
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies..... 809,949,100.00

Total direct and guaranteed debt (includes \$285,900,769.30 not subject to statutory limitation)..... 319,789,785,256.27

⁷ Subject to revision.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, we heartily commend the President and his associates for their ef-

forts in the direction of economy. They have labored long and mightily and with considerable profit. In all my experi-

ences here I do not recall a budget so classically put together. Good budgeting involves the hard necessities of choice.

It involves doing some painful and unpopular things. You can save some money by hacking at the branches but a good deal more by hacking at the roots. I cannot recall a year in which such a broadly based, vigorous "selection out" screening was applied by the President to the budget.

And he unequivocally promises to keep at the business of weeding out the less essential items and getting a dollar's value for a dollar spent.

The Committee on Appropriations does not, of course, process all of the budget but so far as it is our province we intend wholehearted cooperation with the President and the leadership to the end that his budget recommendations are fully considered and disposed of fairly and expeditiously.

We welcome any constructive suggestions from any Member of the House or anyone else. In the spirit of the President's announced determination to dispense with every nonessential, we especially invite specific suggestions. We do not know all the answers. We shall be diligent but likely less than perfect.

We begin hearings on the general budget on Thursday and will shortly develop a schedule of hearings and reporting dates for the various appropriation bills.

COC SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I wish to digress for a moment to make reference to an earlier colloquy today with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. He raised a question as to a one-billion-and-six-hundred or seven-hundred-million-dollar appropriation bill which is scheduled to be on the floor tomorrow involving restoring the impairment of the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Most Members of the House are somewhat familiar with this matter, but at a later point in the RECORD I shall insert a further statement in regard to the item so that all Members will know more precisely what will be before us tomorrow when we take up the bill. The RECORD, of course, will be available at about 7 o'clock in the morning.

I shall be glad to cooperate with my colleagues and other members of the committee will want to cooperate in giving essential information to Members who are interested.

On Thursday last, the House made it in order to consider a supplemental appropriation bill for the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture tomorrow, Tuesday, January 26. This request, in the total amount of \$1,742,209,000, was received by the House on January 19, 1965, and printed as House Document No. 59.

In view of the urgency of this matter and the speed with which it must be handled, it has not been possible to give members the usual 3 days to review the bill and report in advance of floor action. The record of the hearings will not be ready for final printing until tonight.

In order that Members may have as much advance information as possible, and in line with my colloquy earlier today

with the gentleman from Illinois, I take this opportunity to discuss the pending request briefly.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was created by Congress in 1933 to assist in maintaining farm income at a level comparable to labor and industry and thereby stabilize the purchasing power of this basic segment of our national economy upon which all others are dependent. The Corporation is charged with the mandatory responsibility of supporting prices for the six basics—wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco—as well as wool, mohair, certain feed grains, milk, butterfat, honey, and tung nuts. For certain other commodities price supports are permissive, such as cottonseed, flaxseed, soybeans, dry edible beans, and crude pine gum.

In recent years, the Corporation has also been charged with the responsibility of financing many other programs not directly related to its price support activities and not originally contemplated when the Corporation was created. The larger and more expensive programs are the International Wheat Agreement, Public Law 480, and bartered materials for the supplemental stockpile.

To finance these numerous activities, the Corporation has a borrowing authority of \$14.5 billion. As of January 20, 1965, all but \$54 million of this was committed and the Corporation is virtually unable to continue operations.

The Corporation has three possible methods of obtaining additional funds for operating purposes: First, by selling commodities to which it has title; second, through congressional approval to increase its borrowing authority; or third, by an appropriation to restore capital impairment.

For the Corporation to attempt to obtain operating funds by suddenly placing its commodities on domestic and world markets would be disastrous. Also, it does not seem practicable to undertake to pass legislation to increase its borrowing authority this early in the session. The only feasible means to meet this need expeditiously, therefore, is to approve a supplemental appropriation at this time.

Failure to provide additional funds to the Corporation would result in a complete breakdown in our price support mechanism, with serious consequences to the economy of our entire Nation. It is imperative, therefore, that immediate action be taken to restore funds to the Corporation to continue its operations during the balance of the current fiscal year.

THE BUDGET

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to proceed with the further discussion of the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my distinguished chairman that it is necessary for the committee to expedite this work to get the budgets passed as rapidly as possible. But in doing so, we must give careful consideration to each and every item. I think it should always be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the Constitution places upon the Congress the responsibility of appropriations and budgets and that the Budget Bureau can recommend to the President what we shall consider. But we are not bound by those recommendations. They can and should make recommendations but it is our responsibility under the Constitution to handle the appropriations and that starts here in the House of Representatives.

First, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question and then to try to answer it. Is the budget below \$100 billion?

On the face of the matter alone, but especially because of all the advance press buildup of the struggle to keep this budget below \$100 billion, let me try to dispel the persistent myth that the budget has been held below \$100 billion. It has not been, and all one has to do is turn to page 15 of the message where the President says:

This budget includes new obligational authority for 1966 of \$106.4 billion in the administrative budget.

Anyone knows that if the Government makes obligations it must honor them—which in simple language means spend money to pay for them.

This is the third, or perhaps fourth year the obligational budget requested has been above \$100 billion. What difference does it make to the taxpayer in the long run as to just when actual spending crosses the \$100 billion mark—or how many bookkeeping gimmicks are used to delude by keeping the expenditure figure from going over \$100 billion. The end result is unavoidable.

Furthermore, this budget says that in this session the President expects to ask for \$6 billion in supplemental appropriations for the current year 1965 in addition to the \$106.4 billion for fiscal 1966—in other words, a total of \$112.4 billion authority, in this session alone, to make expenditure commitments. Page 38 of today's budget says that so far, \$101.3 billion of new obligational authority has actually been enacted by Congress for this year. So, the President is really asking, in this session, to enact obligational authority of \$11.1 billion above what was done for the current fiscal year. I cannot recall such a large increase in any peacetime budget.

As to any bookkeeping gimmicks, if there are any in the budget we ought to root them out and examine them for what they are.

When are we going to redeem the pledge?

In the tax cut bill last year, Congress gave a pledge to the American people—it was the Democratic majority that wrote the pledge and voted it in the bill—that the increased revenues expected to come into the Treasury would first—I emphasize the word "first"—would first be used to eliminate the budget deficit

and then to reduce the public debt. And the President agreed when he signed the bill.

It takes only a minute to find the figures in this budget to prove that the President evidently wants to break with the promise or at least rearrange it. Look at page 30 of the budget where he says the larger revenues now coming into the Treasury have a potential for, in this order—

Necessary increase in Federal expenditures;

Reduction in taxes; and

Reductions in the public debt.

But, he adds that "no one of these goals is paramount at all times."

In today's budget larger revenues are anticipated but, contrary to the explicit promise, spending increases and tax reductions get priority. This budget hardly pays lip service to the promise. The deficit gets only minor relief and the national debt goes up by \$5.6 billion.

UNBROKEN RECORD OF DEFICITS

This budget, with a deficit projection of \$5.3 billion, is the fifth straight deficit—we have had one every year since President Eisenhower left office—a total of \$32.4 billion in the fiscal years 1962–66. Yet the President likes to characterize his administration as prudent.

Do they really ever expect or intend to restore fiscal responsibility when they advocate going deeper into debt in times of record national prosperity?

The President says this budget marks continued progress on the path toward a balanced budget. Mr. Speaker, it is a mighty slow pace along a mighty long path.

MORE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—26,680 MORE

A much publicized feature of the President's program—one the President himself seemed to be quite interested in—was to trim the number of Federal employees. I expect the average American has the impression the agencies are dropping them from the rolls right and left.

Page 376 of today's budget shows that while they plan to drop some from the defense agencies, they want to add some 45,000 more in civilian agencies.

It would represent about 154,000 more than were on the roll when President Eisenhower left office.

I am certain the committees will want to take a good hard look at these requests.

CONGRESS MUST MEET ITS RESPONSIBILITIES

I hope we do not yield to all the blandishments of bureaucracy. The appetite to expand cannot be satisfied.

I hope the majority does not dust off the rubber stamps of the 1930's.

I hope the majority refuses to take all these requests at face value and gives every one of them a thorough examination.

I hope we can find solid ways to further economize—at least of the magnitude we were able to in the last two sessions when we cut about \$10.5 billion from the appropriations actually requested.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very interested in the point you make on the deficiency requests that will total \$5.978 billion, which makes the total new obligational authority for 1965 \$107.3 billion. On page 15 of the report the President shows that that is the figure and then the report has his \$106.4 billion for 1966, which makes it look like his requests for 1966 are a little bit lower.

I remember last year when the budget was presented that the gentleman from Ohio and some others pointed out that we felt there were bound to be deficiencies and that the budget was presented in such a way as to disguise this fact. Now, sure enough, this has turned out to be correct. It is a \$6 billion deficiency. Could we look at this budget and can your committee do so to ferret out the hidden deficiencies? I hope you will look at this budget of \$106.4 billion of requests to see what you think the real deficiencies will come to next year. I ask that because I suspect not only is this a request for \$112.4 billion, \$106.4 plus the \$6 billion deficiency, but it also has inherent in it probably another \$6 or \$7 billion of deficiencies that are going to occur by the end of the year.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman is quite right. Of course, we shall look for these areas where we may be called upon for deficiencies. It is rather interesting that before the Committee on Appropriations is actually organized in this session of Congress we have a deficiency or a supplemental request here for \$1.4 billion. A part of that is to come up tomorrow for a program which we understood was going to save money, but now we find that program which was going to save money costs considerably more money. I am talking about the cotton program which will be discussed tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the impact of the Federal budget in the national and world economies no longer permits it to be judged in simple or isolated terms. By every realistic test the 1966 budget is fiscally responsible beyond any doubt.

This budget meets the Nation's basic needs—for defense, for space research, for international representation, and for economic assistance.

This budget awakens us to the fact that our national strength lies in our people—and that investment in them promises high dividends in economic growth which is the source of fiscal strength.

This budget shows concern with the continued improvement in the equity, efficiency, and flexibility of the tax system—both as an end in itself and for the effect which it has for encouraging sound economic growth.

This budget shows sensitivity to the current state of the economy by offering continued economic stimulus on an adequate but not excessive scale.

This budget offers continued improvement in the vital balance-of-payments position with nearly a \$400 million reduction in payments abroad by Federal

agencies carrying out vital responsibilities overseas.

This budget continues the progress toward fiscal balance with a \$1 billion reduction in the deficit—the third consecutive year of reduction and the lowest deficit in 5 years, despite the effect of tax cuts totaling over \$4½ billion.

This budget demonstrates continued control over the growth in Federal expenditures with an increase of only \$2 billion over the 2-year period 1964–66—the second lowest 2-year increase in the past decade.

Thus, from every angle, the 1966 budget shows evidence of a solid understanding of the sources of fiscal strength, of the uses and purposes of fiscal power, and the true spirit of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, once again the President has demonstrated that it is possible for the Federal Government to be both responsive and responsible—responsive to the Nation's needs and responsible to the taxpayer.

The budget we have just received provides greatly needed increases for programs of education, health, manpower, and training, economic opportunity, and urban development that are aimed at stimulating improvements in the life of all our people.

But, the budget also proposes to make these increases in a selective and responsible manner—and at a pace consistent with growth in our ability to pay. In this way, progress toward a balanced budget goes hand in hand with social and economic progress.

It is also gratifying to see from the budget that the President understands that encouragement of private and State and local activities deserves emphasis along with improvements in Federal activities and functions. The excise tax cut will leave an additional \$1½ billion in the hands of individuals and business firms to be spent as they see fit. At the same time, aids to State and local governments will rise by over \$2 billion to record levels.

These facts amply demonstrate the President's concern with the Nation's needs wherever they exist and his desire that they be solved by means that are appropriate.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget has come a step closer under President Johnson's 1966 budget. The President is to be congratulated for being fiscally responsible as well as compassionate for the aged, the needy, and the underprivileged.

The expected deficit of \$5.3 billion for 1966 will be the smallest deficit in the past 5 years. At the same time, this is a stimulative budget for the Nation's economy. The combination of tax and expenditure proposals can only result in continued economic growth, higher personal incomes, and increased employment. The Secretary of the Treasury tells us that a balanced budget may be possible 2 or 3 years from now—without starving our public needs, and even with a cut in excise taxes.

Every Member of Congress should welcome this budget as a sign of solid economic strength and good fiscal policy. It

is good news for the American people and for every nation whose security and future is linked to our own.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, our Government today is asked to serve our country on a scale without precedent.

Our people have urgent needs—for more and better public services, better economic and cultural opportunities, and a better environment.

Our State and local governments need assistance in meeting their traditional responsibilities.

Our Nation needs the strongest national defense that we can provide.

Our society needs to be sure that growth produces not just quantity of abundance, but quality as well.

These are the tests by which we should judge the President's budget for fiscal year 1966. President Johnson himself has told us that it is a budget of priorities. That is what a budget should be. It cannot do everything at once, but it can show us what needs to be done first and foremost, within our means.

This is a reasonable, constructive budget. We owe it to the President to consider it on a reasonable and constructive basis.

We will not agree with every detail, and the President does not expect us to. But if we do our part as well as the President has done his part, this budget can be the basis for the most constructive Congress of this generation.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget gives us a program for continued national prosperity and growth.

During the past 4 years, we have enjoyed an average rate of economic growth of over 5 percent. Unemployment has dropped from 7 percent of the labor force in early 1961 to about 5 percent today. We must continue this unprecedented economic advance.

Only a few years ago, our economy was moving erratically along a path of retarded growth, accompanied by the monetary and social costs of widespread unemployment. Many had to forgo opportunities because of reduced incomes, while others felt the heavy hand of unemployment. I need not chronicle the hardship and loss of self-esteem which result from inability to provide adequately for one's own family.

The 1966 budget contains many measures to avert the dire consequences of inadequate growth. All of them follow the pattern—so evident under President Johnson—of reliance on a dynamic private sector of the economy. One important example is the proposed \$1¼ billion cut in excise taxes, which will transfer additional buying power to consumers and businesses.

In sum, it is essential that we continue to promote national prosperity and economic growth. This budget will do that.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the 1966 budget which President Johnson has submitted to us today presents a forward-looking program which provides generously for many of the needs of our people. In addition to many existing activities, it proposes several new programs which represent a noble

beginning toward the realization of the Great Society which will benefit all Americans.

In reviewing the 1966 budget, it is apparent that the President has applied a critical hand in weeding out many less urgent but costly Government activities. These cost reductions, led by the outstanding performance of the Department of Defense, have saved the taxpayers of this country several billion dollars in the past year—including \$3½ billion last year—and have made it possible to carry out many urgent activities that otherwise might have had to be postponed. This budget is a vivid example of what can be done to eliminate waste and inefficiency in Government.

The 1966 budget also reflects the President's promise to maintain strict control over the level of civilian employment in the executive branch of the Government. It is apparent from this budget that President Johnson feels as strongly as we in Congress—and, I am sure, most of the American people—feel that there should be enough Government workers to carry out the essential activities required of our Government, but that there should be no more than are needed. In spite of the growth in certain existing programs and in spite of additional programs proposed for the first time, President Johnson has pointed out in his budget that Federal civilian employment will grow at only about 1 percent—far less than the population, State and local government employment, or total civilian employment. This is not only a credit to the President and his department and agency heads for maintaining strict employment controls but it is also a credit to the Government employees whose increased productivity contributes heavily to the results.

There is ample evidence throughout the 1966 budget that cost consciousness was given heavy weight in the President's forward-looking program.

Mr. Speaker, I like the direction of this budget. Foreign aid and foreign expenditures have been deemphasized and higher priorities are given to projects of importance in the United States. I am pleased that the Appalachia program has been pinpointed in the President's budget.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the administration is to be commended for the quality of its proposals in the budget for fiscal year 1966.

They guarantee the continued superiority of our Armed Forces while demonstrating our commitment to world peace and prosperity. As the richest nation in the world, we must both see to our responsibilities abroad and heed the pleas of our less fortunate people here at home.

The most striking feature of the President's budget is its accent on human needs. Health, labor, welfare, and education programs alone will increase by \$6½ billion over 1965. Including housing and community development, these programs amounted to about 15 percent of total Federal outlays only 10 years ago; today, they account for nearly 30 percent of all Federal payments.

This budget recognizes that no nation can achieve greatness except by building

its human resources, and building them well.

Our objective is to stop the appalling costs resulting from poverty and unemployment. Last year alone, the Nation lost more than \$25 billion in potential output due to our failure to provide productive employment for more of our workers. We want to guarantee that all Americans have the opportunity to share in national prosperity and well-being. Prosperity and individual fulfillment ought to become more than mere words to the one-fifth of the Nation living in poverty.

This budget sets us on the right course. The Nation will be watching to see how we respond.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the 1966 budget which President Johnson has submitted to us today is a prudent budget, one that is not extravagant nor wasteful of the Nation's resources. There is no doubt, however, that this budget was prepared with more than merely efficiency and economy in mind. Throughout the entire budget, it is evident that the President has given careful consideration to the need for the economic stimulus necessary to help promote economic strength and progress. It is also evident that President Johnson, in preparing his 1966 budget, has kept in mind the need to move toward a balanced budget.

The financial pages of our daily newspapers and trade journals are ample evidence of the overwhelming success of the recent tax cut which was enacted last year. Our gross national product continues to move up rapidly, personal incomes have grown substantially, and private consumption and investment have responded favorably to the stimulus provided.

The 1966 budget now proposes to reinforce the Revenue Act of 1964 by revising and adjusting excise taxes. As President Johnson well recognizes, in addition to improving the tax system, these recommended changes will further greatly increase private purchasing power and stimulate growth in the economy.

The stimulus to economic growth provided by the 1966 budget is not limited to the revenue side, however. Government expenditures, on an administrative and cash budget basis as well as on a national income basis, will increase in 1966 over 1965. Many of the expenditure programs are designed to reinforce private consumption and investment. For example such programs as old-age and survivors insurance benefits, unemployment compensation, veterans benefits, public assistance grants, and grants to State and local governments all help to reinforce the purchasing power of other sectors of the economy.

Another example of how the 1966 budget will help stimulate the economic growth and progress is the billions of dollars of Federal expenditures of an investment nature. These expenditures for investment in physical and human resources are an important factor in the continued economic growth of our economy and are essential for achieving a higher rate of economic growth in the

future, as well. As pointed out in the 1966 budget:

Of the total Federal cash payments to the public estimated for 1966, about \$14.9 billion or 11.7 percent are for activities (outside of defense and space) which—directly or indirectly—will increase physical assets and otherwise promote productivity and economic growth.

In spite of increased budget expenditures and the estimated excess of Federal payments over receipts, the President's 1966 budget is mindful of the necessity to maintain price stability along with economic growth. As with the past several budgets, it is apparent that the 1966 budget can and will provide an economic stimulus without leading to price instability.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the 1966 budget represents a high water mark in the history of responsible government.

It meets head on the important challenges which confront our Nation. For example, through the programs proposed in the budget we will: greatly increase our attack on poverty in the United States; increase education assistance by 75 percent; provide more and better health care for our citizens, particularly our children and the elderly; and make our cities better places in which to live.

Responsible government also requires that we meet our needs at costs which we, as a nation, can afford. The 1966 budget meets this criterion by holding administrative budget expenditures below \$100 billion for the second year in succession—although increases in fixed commitments would indicate that this was impossible; and providing for a reduction in the deficit for the second straight year as our economy continues to grow and move us toward a balanced budget.

The 1966 budget is the essence of responsible government. It meets the needs of our people well. It meets them without overburdening our resources.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the budget for 1966 which President Johnson has submitted to us today recognizes fully the accelerating pace of growth and change which in recent years has led to increasing demands for services from the Federal Government. However, in spite of all the criticism about the size of the Federal Government and the growth of the Federal budget it is necessary to bear in mind some of the relative comparisons involved.

In 1966, Federal administrative budget expenditures are estimated to be \$99.7 billion. In the decade ending with fiscal 1966, Federal expenditures will have increased by an estimated 50 percent. Over the same period, however, the gross national product will have risen over 60 percent. While Federal expenditures rose as a proportion of the GNP during the first part of this 10-year period, they are now falling for the third year in a row and in 1966 will drop to less than 15 percent, the lowest ratio in 15 years.

On a national income basis, the same trend is also evident. As seen from the 1966 budget document, Federal purchases of goods and services were 11.1 percent of the GNP in 1956. In 1966 they are estimated to be about 10 percent, also

the lowest proportion of the past 15 years. In other words, despite a growing economy, a growing population, and a growing budget, the Federal Government's direct share of the Nation's total output of goods and services is declining. Moreover, while Federal purchases of goods and services will increase by less than \$1 billion in 1966 over 1965, State and local governments will probably increase its direct purchases of goods and services by a considerably greater amount in 1966. With a continuing pressure at the local level for increased public services, present indications are that State and local governments will continue to increase their direct purchases of goods and services by at least and possibly more than the \$3 to \$5 billion by which they have been increasing in recent years.

We have here in the budget submitted to us today a financial plan which provides for many of the needs of our people. It has been prepared with careful forethought and consideration of economy and efficiency. While it provides for some increase in total expenditures, these increases have been carefully weighed against the costs involved.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this is a budget neither extravagant nor parsimonious, neither wasteful nor pinchpenny. From behind all the complex figures, this document emerges clearly as a people's budget. It is a plan keyed to the needs of all our people.

It is a budget that recognizes that a dollar well spent will bring far more than a dollar value in return, to the Nation, the State, the local community.

The President's emphasis on health and education and aid to the needy is not only heartwarming and reassuring for its humanism, but it is also a reminder to us that this is an investment for all of us, every one of us, in the future greatness of America. This is an investment that makes hardrock economic sense.

Our human resources are our most valuable asset, and no segment of it should remain fallow. These 35 million people, who represent a vast untapped vein of economic wealth, should not remain unproductive because of lack of opportunity to develop their skills and capabilities. And this budget reaches out far to embrace many of the Nation's 35 million poverty-ridden people with an offer to help them get on their feet, to get the country rolling with gathering speed toward a full, no-unemployment economy.

The people of the West, in particular my own district, will be gratified at the proper recognition of the need for investments in multipurpose river structures. The calamity, which was the December 1964 flood, teaches us again the wisdom of investing our resources in preventative flood control structures rather than squandering them in repairing the frequently avoidable damage both to property and, even more important, preventing the loss of life and the destruction of human values in the flood-threatened areas.

The magic figure in this budget is not \$100 billion—the magic is in each of the pieces that make up the \$100 billion that will help this Nation achieve greater heights by opening wider the doors of opportunity to these neglected people who are capable of contributing to our growing economy, but who need a helping hand.

THE BILL TO PAY FOR LAST YEAR'S COTTON FOLLY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider a supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. The time has now come to pay the piper for last year's cotton folly.

In April of 1964 Congress passed and the President approved H.R. 6196, the so-called cotton-wheat bill. Those of us who were here at the time and who opposed this legislation pointed out that H.R. 6196 would cost the taxpayers of this Nation millions of more dollars per year, that it would result in multimillion-dollar Government payments to U.S. textile companies, that the plight of small cotton farmers would not be eased, and that consumers were not assured of any benefits.

What has the record been since the enactment of this legislation?

Let us take a look at it.

During the House debate the ranking Republican on the Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable Charles B. Hoeven, of Iowa, stated that additional costs of the cotton program would rise to \$635.9 million.

During that debate the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT], then a member of the Committee on Agriculture wrote to each of us in the House, explaining that the bulk of the new expense would be used in a domestic mill subsidy and said, and I quote:

The Democrats have long stood for priming the pump at the bottom. The theory of the pending bill, I believe, is alien to our philosophy. Should the mill subsidy provision be included in the final version of the bill, I would ask you to consider seriously defeating this legislation.

Yes, Republicans and Democrats opposed this bill, but it passed.

On November 9, 1964, the Department of Agriculture published the list of payments made to individual textile mills and others in the cotton processing industry. And I want to remind you that these are just the interim payments. The payments for the 1964 marketing year will be much greater.

The interim payments reached a total of \$86.1 million, of which \$57 million was in cash and \$29.1 million in kind—surplus cotton. You may recall assurances during debate on the cotton bill that the program would be financed by using sur-

plus cotton, not by cash. Up to this point, at least, it certainly has not worked out that way.

You will note that several firms have already received multimillion payments under the interim program, and this is but a fraction of their entitlement during the 1964 and 1965 marketing years.

To illustrate the magnitude, I have combined the interim payments for four firms. The totals may not be complete, but they at least illustrate why the cotton program is so costly, and why the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation needs replenishment. The cost of the cotton program, as with most commodity programs, is financed largely by drawing money out of CCC. When the

CCC account gets low—and it certainly is low now—the administration asks for more.

Here are grand total figures for the four mills, as disclosed by the November 9, 1954, report of the Department of Agriculture. And once more, I repeat that these figures are for the interim period only, and are much lower than entitlement for an entire marketing year.

J. P. Stevens & Co., Greenville, S.C.:	
Georgia plant.....	\$343,980.44
North Carolina plant.....	889,835.52
South Carolina plant.....	2,650,133.52
Tennessee plant.....	322,407.33
Total.....	4,206,356.81

Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C.:	
North Carolina plant.....	\$3,224,433.32
South Carolina plant.....	182,299.77
Total.....	3,406,733.09

Cone Mills Corp., Greensboro, N.C.:	
North Carolina plant.....	2,980,212.07
South Carolina plant.....	106,249.32
Total.....	3,086,461.39
The Springs Cotton Mills, Lancaster, S.C.: South Carolina plant.....	3,780,297.40

Here are the detailed payments during the interim. They can be verified by direct reference to USDA release of November 9, 1964, serial USDA 3725-64.

Individual interim payments during the period Apr. 11-July 31, 1964

Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total	Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total
ALABAMA				GEORGIA—continued			
Adelaide Mills, Inc., Anniston, Ala.	\$49,837.32	\$65,460.65	\$115,297.97	Chicopee Manufacturing Co., New Brunswick, N.J.	\$360,065.98	0	\$360,065.98
Alabama Board of Corrections, Kilby Cotton Mill, Montgomery, Ala.	8,069.29	0	8,069.29	Coats & Clark, Inc., Albany, Ga.	6,573.88	0	6,573.88
Aliceville Cotton Mill, Aliceville, Ala.	20,862.14	81,675.75	102,537.89	Coats & Clark, Inc., Clarkdale, Ga.	67,545.72	0	67,545.72
American Cyanamid Co., Santa Rosa plant, Post Office Box 1826, Pensacola, Fla.	204.29	0	204.29	Crompton Highland Mills, Griffin, Ga.	91,826.39	0	91,826.39
Anniston Manufacturing Co., Anniston, Ala.	270,087.81	0	270,087.81	Crown Cotton Mills, Dalton, Ga.	344,623.09	0	344,623.09
Avondale Mills, Sylacauga, Ala.	365,070.01	1,455,918.18	1,820,988.19	Crystal Springs Bleachery, Chickamauga, Ga.	338,280.52	0	338,280.52
Bama Cotton Mills, Inc., Geneva, Ala.	22,651.91	94,790.99	117,442.90	Dundee Mills, Griffin, Ga.	466,636.40	0	466,636.40
Bemis Bros. Bag Co., Talladega, Ala.	331,777.16	0	331,777.16	Eastman Cotton Mills, Eastman, Ga.	185,650.07	0	185,650.07
Botany Cotton, Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	42,640.58	0	42,640.58	Echota Cotton Mills, Calhoun, Ga.	75,479.55	0	75,479.55
Carlton-McLendon Furniture Co., Montgomery, Ala.	163.86	0	163.86	Erwin Mills, Durham, N.C.	10,083.44	0	10,083.44
Cowikee Mills, Eufaula, Ala.	72,940.78	288,422.72	361,363.50	Federal Prison Industries, Atlanta, Ga.	144,306.68	0	144,306.68
Danville Yarn Mills, Bon Air, Ala.	171,049.24	0	171,049.24	Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C.	160,756.44	\$178,958.45	339,714.89
Dan River Mills, Inc., Post Office Box 261, Danville, Va.		318,134.20	318,134.20	Fitzgerald Mills Corp., Fitzgerald, Ga.	41,477.27	0	41,477.27
Fayette Cotton Mills, Inc., Fayette, Ala.	31,341.18	143,501.92	174,843.10	Flagg-Utica Corp., Greenville, Ga.	94,515.19	0	94,515.19
Geneva Cotton Mills, Inc., Geneva, Ala.	22,669.40	89,644.10	112,313.50	Flint River Cotton Mills, Albany, Ga.	140,636.40	51,787.38	192,423.78
Standard-Coosa-Thatcher Co., Box 791, Chattanooga, Tenn.	120,682.11	136,271.78	256,953.89	Franklin Novelty Yarn Co., Lavonia, Ga.	357.04	0	357.04
Union Yarn Mills, Jacksonville, Ala.	47,416.98	167,764.22	215,181.20	Fulton Cotton Mills, Atlanta, Ga.	216,388.50	0	216,388.50
Victorian Furniture Corp., Montgomery, Ala.	588.76	0	588.76	Gainesville Mills, Gainesville, Ga.	102,582.02	139,362.40	241,944.42
Wehadkee Yarn Mills, Box 150, West Point, Ga.	117,880.03	140,518.42	258,398.45	Georgia Duck & Cordage Mill, Scottdale, Ga.	50,072.35	0	50,072.35
West Boylston Manufacturing Co., Montgomery, Ala.	82,638.01	98,060.36	180,698.37	B. F. Goodrich Textile Products, Thomaston, Ga.	553,579.70	210,813.78	764,393.48
West Point Manufacturing Co., Post Office Box 71, West Point, Ga.	347,948.37	1,385,388.53	1,733,336.90	Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C.	111,438.79	475,156.42	586,595.21
Winfield Cotton Mill, Inc., Winfield, Ala.	15,687.55	56,430.59	72,118.14	Habersham Mills, Habersham, Ga.	126,397.89	0	126,397.89
Total.....	4,301,997.90	5,427,776.88	9,729,774.78	Harmony Grove Mill, Commerce, Ga.	237,272.16	0	237,272.16
ARKANSAS				Harriet & Henderson Cotton Mills, Ber-ryton, Ga.	169,172.95	0	169,172.95
Crompton-Arkansas Mills, Inc., Morrilton, Ark.	240,545.18	0	240,545.18	Hartwell Mills, Hartwell, Ga.	100,598.15	0	100,598.15
Earl of Arkansas Division, Earle, Ark.	36.08	0	36.08	Imperial Cotton Mills, Eatonton, Ga.	57,722.01	20,662.72	78,384.73
Pinecrest Cotton Mills, Inc., Pine Bluff, Ark.	41,898.73	0	41,898.73	The Jefferson Mills, Jefferson, Ga.	172,360.09	0	172,360.09
Total.....	282,479.99	0	282,479.99	Juliette Milling Co., Macon, Ga.	27,923.86	0	27,923.86
CALIFORNIA				The John P. King Manufacturing Co., Augusta, Ga.	301,558.00	100,314.43	401,872.43
L. A. Sani-Felt Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	1,168.43	0	1,168.43	Klopman Mills, Inc., Greensboro, N.C.	149,848.45	0	149,848.45
California State Prison, San Quentin, Calif.	5,129.28	0	5,129.28	Lavonia Manufacturing Co., Hickory, N.C.	8,726.63	0	8,726.63
Total.....	6,297.71	0	6,297.71	Mary-Leila Cotton Mills, Inc., Greensboro, Ga.	97,858.72	0	97,858.72
CONNECTICUT				Monroe Mills, Monroe, Ga.	142,287.07	0	142,287.07
American Thread Co., Inc., 260 West Broadway, New York, N.Y.	45,531.51	0	45,531.51	Moultrie Cotton Mills, Moultrie, Ga.	79,416.93	0	79,416.93
Acme Cotton Products Co., Inc., East Killingly, Conn.	5,654.41	0	5,654.41	New Holland Mills, New Holland, Ga.	215,143.11	261,326.19	476,469.30
Baltic Mills Co., Baltic, Conn.	6,549.19	0	6,549.19	Opelika Manufacturing Co., Hawkinsville, Ga.	67,770.09	0	67,770.09
Gould Products Corp.	4,717.88	0	4,717.88	Pepperell Manufacturing Co., Boston, Mass.	372,793.97	835,261.11	1,208,055.08
Total.....	62,452.99	0	62,452.99	Piedmont Cotton Mills, East Point, Ga.	2,450.56	0	2,450.56
GEORGIA				Puritan Cordage Mill, Athens, Ga.	3,285.35	0	3,285.35
Aragon Mill, Aragon, Ga.	360.03	0	360.03	Reeves Bros., Inc., Spartanburg, S.C.	192,656.68	0	192,656.68
Applied Fiber Co., Grantville, Ga.	1,142.89	0	1,142.89	Reigel Textile Corp., Trion, Ga.	959,150.20	0	959,150.20
Atlantic Cotton Mills, Macon, Ga.	68,361.86	0	68,361.86	Rushton Cotton Mills, Griffin, Ga.	93,678.26	0	93,678.26
Avondale Mills, Sylacauga, Ala.	48,549.03	80,822.99	129,372.02	Scottdale Mills, Scottdale, Ga.	153,574.65	0	153,574.65
Bibb Manufacturing Co., Macon, Ga.	1,102,611.38	599,491.28	1,702,102.66	Social Circle Cotton Mills, Social Circle, Ga.	72,325.69	23,095.93	95,421.62
Buck Creek Cotton Mills, Columbiana, Ala.	26,159.24	0	26,159.24	Southern Mills, Atlanta, Ga.	33,222.53	0	33,222.53
Callaway Mills, LaGrange, Ga.	660,275.17	0	660,275.17	J. P. Stevens & Co., Greenville, S.C.	0	343,980.44	343,980.44
Canton Cotton Mills, Canton, Ga.	466,082.30	0	466,082.30	Strickland Cotton Mills, Valdosta, Ga.	157,163.43	51,404.79	208,568.22
				Summersville Manufacturing Co., Summersville, Ga.	117,631.20	0	117,631.20
				Swift Manufacturing Co., Columbus, Ga.	287,591.33	111,773.22	399,364.55
				Swift Spinning Mills, Columbus, Ga.	228,139.72	80,968.29	309,108.01
				The American Thread Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.	237,771.42	0	237,771.42
				The Blanche Cotton Mills, Augusta, Ga.	39,237.63	0	39,237.63
				Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Cedar-town, Ga.	103,765.39	0	103,765.39
				Jordan Co., Columbus, Ga.	14,990.81	0	14,990.81
				Thomaston Cotton Mills, Thomaston, Ga.	675,907.29	0	675,907.29
				Tifton Cotton Mills, Tifton, Ga.	88,754.37	0	88,754.37
				Trion Manufacturing Co., Forsyth, Ga.	25,801.80	0	25,801.80
				Union Manufacturing Co., Union Point, Ga.	19,216.65	0	19,216.65

Individual interim payments during the period Apr. 11–July 31, 1964—Continued

Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total	Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total
GEORGIA—continued				NEW HAMPSHIRE			
United States Rubber Co., Hogsansville, Ga.	\$165,763.81	0	\$165,763.81	Chicopee Manufacturing Co., 501 George Street, New Brunswick, N.J.	\$285,788.82	0	\$285,788.82
Walton Cotton Mills, Monroe, Ga.	233,191.91	0	233,191.91	Total	285,788.82	0	285,788.82
Washington Manufacturing Co., Tennessee, Ga.	66,739.98	0	66,739.98	NEW YORK			
West Georgia Mills, Inc., Whitesburg, Ga.	7,778.47	0	7,778.47	Clinton Prison Industries, Dannemora, N.Y.	9,131.07	0	9,131.07
West Point Manufacturing Co., West Point, Ga.	105,879.47	\$470,602.51	576,481.98	Greenhaven Prison Industries, Stormville, N.Y.	4,598.69	0	4,598.69
Whitfield Spinning Co., Dallas, Ga.	53,672.06	0	53,672.06	Lockport Mill, Inc., Lockport, N.Y.	131.75	0	131.75
Whittier Mills Co., Atlanta, Ga.	108,052.80	0	108,052.80	Total	13,861.51	0	13,861.51
Willingham Cotton Mills, Macon, Ga.	98,969.64	0	98,969.64	NORTH CAROLINA			
Total	12,609,630.50	4,035,782.33	16,645,412.83	Acme Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C.	190,035.55	0	190,035.55
ILLINOIS				Alexander Mills, Forest City, N.C.	147,055.86	\$54,838.29	201,894.15
Bear Brand Hosiery Co., Chicago, Ill.	49,976.82	0	49,976.82	Amazon Cotton Mills Co., Thomasville, N.C.	73,864.66	25,443.01	99,307.67
Johnson & Johnson, Chicago, Ill.	63,095.50	0	63,095.50	American & Efrd Mills, Inc., Mount Holly, N.C.	598,776.71	0	598,776.71
Total	113,072.32	0	113,072.32	Arista Mills Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.	109,391.81	0	109,391.81
IOWA				Balston Yarn Mills, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C.	14,535.75	0	14,535.75
Iowa State Industries, Textile Division, Fort Madison, Iowa	4,474.72	0	4,474.72	Barnhardt Manufacturing Co., Charlotte, N.C.	2,523.43	0	2,523.43
Total	4,474.72	0	4,474.72	Bartex Spinning Co., Clayton, N.C.	60,391.10	0	60,391.10
KANSAS				Beaunit Corp., 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.	30,518.01	0	30,518.01
American Felt Mfg. Co., Inc., Kansas City, Kans.	62.20	0	62.20	B. I. Cotton Mills, Asheville, N.C.	239,294.43	0	239,294.43
Total	62.20	0	62.20	B. I. Cotton Mills, Caroleen, N.C.	195,543.78	0	195,543.78
KENTUCKY				B. I. Cotton Mills, Marion, N.C.	143,379.59	0	143,379.59
Jamuary & Wood Co., Inc., Maysville, Ky.	43,959.56	0	43,959.56	B. I. Cotton Mills, Henrietta, N.C.	125,877.36	0	125,877.36
Louisville Textiles, Inc., Louisville, Ky.	7,503.33	0	7,503.33	Bladenboro Cotton Mills, Inc., Bladenboro, N.C.	253,960.19	0	253,960.19
Total	51,462.89	0	51,462.89	Bonnie Cotton Mills, Kings Mountain, N.C.	16,093.14	0	16,093.14
MAINE				Borden Manufacturing Co., Goldsboro, N.C.	91,315.39	79,348.67	170,664.06
Pepperell Manufacturing Co., Boston, Mass.	83,300.30	318,670.55	401,970.85	Botany Cottons, Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	270,292.11	0	270,292.11
Bates Manufacturing Co., Post Office Box 591, Lewiston, Maine	643,125.63	0	643,125.63	Caldwell Cotton Mill Co., Lenoir, N.C.	66,117.01	0	66,117.01
Total	726,425.93	318,670.55	1,045,096.48	Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C.	2,426,755.67	797,677.65	3,224,433.32
MASSACHUSETTS				Carlton Yarn Mills, Inc., Cherryville, N.C.	14,340.16	0	14,340.16
Berkshire-Hathaway, Inc., New Bedford, Mass.	100,360.83	0	100,360.83	Carlton Yarn Mills, Inc., Salisbury, N.C.	3,779.55	0	3,779.55
The Kendall Co., Walpole, Mass.	7,458.47	0	7,458.47	Carolina Mills, Inc., Malden, N.C.	454,170.44	0	454,170.44
Maplewood Yarn Mills, Inc., Fall River, Mass.	35.56	0	35.56	Carolinian Mills No. 167, High Shoals, N.C.	210,823.00	0	210,823.00
Sagamore Manufacturing Co., Fall River, Mass.	34,133.12	0	34,133.12	China Grove Cotton Mills Co., Inc., China Grove, N.C.	114,199.85	0	114,199.85
United Cotton Products Co., Fall River, Mass.	1,767.73	0	1,767.73	The Chronicle Mills, Belmont, N.C.	126,418.88	0	126,418.88
Total	143,755.71	0	143,755.71	Clayton Spinning Co., Gastonia, N.C.	67,215.25	0	67,215.25
MICHIGAN				Cleveland Mills Co., Lawndale, N.C.	80,945.85	0	80,945.85
Michigan State Industries, Jackson, Mich.	4,893.27	0	4,893.27	Climax Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C.	126,568.26	0	126,568.26
Total	4,893.27	0	4,893.27	Clyde Fabrics, Inc., Newton, N.C.	174,357.10	0	174,357.10
MISSISSIPPI				Cone Mills Corp., Greensboro, N.C.	646,619.74	2,333,592.33	2,980,212.07
Erwin Mills, Inc., Durham, N.C.	327,645.69	102,419.13	430,064.82	Corriher Mills Co., Landis, N.C.	144,134.43	0	144,134.43
Mississippi Industries for the Blind, Jackson, Miss.	289.25	0	289.25	Craftspun Yarns, Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C.	149,624.15	0	149,624.15
Total	327,934.94	102,419.13	430,354.07	Cramerton Mills, Cramerton, N.C.	202,651.07	0	202,651.07
MISSOURI				Crescent Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C.	68,245.64	0	68,245.64
American White Cross Labs of Missouri, Cape Girardeau, Mo.	2,357.82	0	2,357.82	Cross Cotton Mills Co., Marion, N.C.	147,762.99	0	147,762.99
Absorbent Cotton Co., Valley Park, Mo.	456.69	0	456.69	Dacotah Cotton Mills, Inc., Lexington, N.C.	158,290.91	0	158,290.91
Total	2,814.51	0	2,814.51	Dora Yarn Mill Co., Cherryville, N.C.	13,910.76	0	13,910.76
PUERTO RICO				Dover Mill Co., Shelby, N.C.	5,623.72	0	5,623.72
Ponce Mills, Inc., Ponce, P.R.	8,417.96	0	8,417.96	Dover Yarn Mill, Inc., Shelby, N.C.	5,272.46	0	5,272.46
Total	8,417.96	0	8,417.96	Durham Hosiery Mills, Durham, N.C.	2,863.36	0	2,863.36
				Eagle Yarn Mills, Inc., Belmont, N.C.	71,825.12	0	71,825.12
				Eastern Manufacturing Co., Selma, N.C.	72,602.98	0	72,602.98
				Edenton Cotton Mills, Edenton, N.C.	69,264.45	0	69,264.45
				Elizabeth City Cotton Mills, Elizabeth City, N.C.	38,376.38	0	38,376.38
				The Elk Cotton Mills, Inc., Fayetteville, Tenn.	24,087.09	0	24,087.09
				Erlanger Mills, Inc., Lexington, N.C.	73,803.79	0	73,803.79
				Erwin Mills, Inc., Durham, N.C.	1,371,229.44	0	1,371,229.44
				Esther Mill Corp., Shelby, N.C.	2,288.32	0	2,288.32
				Falls Manufacturing Co., Granite Falls, N.C.	86,974.94	0	86,974.94
				Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C.	197,406.34	204,475.75	401,882.09
				Filterite Corp., Timonium, Md.	780.84	0	780.84
				Firestone Textiles, Gastonia, N.C.	43,136.26	0	43,136.26
				Flint Plant, Gastonia, N.C.	196,958.12	0	196,958.12
				Gambrell Melvin, Inc., Bessemer City, N.C.	55,293.74	0	55,293.74
				Gibson & Cushman, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C.	30,473.10	0	30,473.10
				Glen Raven Cotton Mills, Inc., Kinston, N.C.	4,659.00	0	4,659.00
				Globe Mill, Mount Holly, N.C.	22,504.62	0	22,504.62
				Golden Belt Manufacturing Co., Durham, N.C.	52,659.35	0	52,659.35
				Groves Thread Co., Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	83,160.27	0	83,160.27

Individual interim payments during the period Apr. 11–July 31, 1964—Continued

Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total	Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total
NORTH CAROLINA—continued				NORTH CAROLINA—continued			
Hadley-Peoples Manufacturing Co., Siler City, N.C.	\$97,033.94	0	\$97,033.94	Rudisill Spinning Mills, Inc., Hickory, N.C.	\$12,633.26	0	\$12,633.26
P. H. Hanes Knitting Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.	165,693.32	\$192,443.22	358,136.54	Sadie Cotton Mills Co., Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C.	30,604.46	0	30,604.46
Harriet Cotton Mills, Henderson, N.C.	131,302.65	158,724.27	290,026.92	Schneider Mills, Inc., Taylorsville, N.C.	15,040.47	0	15,040.47
Hart Cotton Mills, Tarboro, N.C.	180,844.38	0	180,844.38	Scotland Mills, Inc., Lancaster, S.C.	330,030.71	0	330,030.71
Hayes Cotton Mill Co., Lenoir, N.C.	28,154.88	0	28,154.88	Sellers Manufacturing Co., Saxapahaw, N.C.	42,604.38	0	42,604.38
Henderson Cotton Mills, Henderson, N.C.	150,566.26	188,541.27	339,107.53	Shelby Mills, Inc., Shelby, N.C.	4,317.48	0	4,317.48
Henry River Mills Co., Henry River, N.C.	5,978.24	0	5,978.24	Sherrill Yarn Mills, Inc., Taylorsville, N.C.	2,378.09	0	2,378.09
Hickory Spinners, Inc., Hickory, N.C.	449,721.22	0	449,721.22	Shuford Mills, Inc., Hickory, N.C.	122,065.02	0	122,065.02
Highland Cotton Mills, Inc., High Point, N.C.	200,563.00	71,129.64	271,692.64	Smitherman Cotton Mills, Troy, N.C.	73,746.58	0	73,746.58
Highland Park Manufacturing Co., Charlotte, N.C.	169,727.61	0	169,727.61	Smithfield Spinning Co., Smithfield, N.C.	135,818.15	0	135,818.15
Holt-Williamson Manufacturing Co., Fayetteville, N.C.	50,380.84	0	50,380.84	A. M. Smyre Manufacturing Co., Gastonia, N.C.	164,837.85	\$71,010.42	235,848.27
Howell Manufacturing Co., Cherryville, N.C.	32,204.18	0	32,204.18	South Fork Manufacturing Co., Belmont, N.C.	81,455.72	0	81,455.72
Hudson Cotton Manufacturing Co., Inc., Lenoir, N.C.	29,537.23	0	29,537.23	Spindale Mills, Inc., Spindale, N.C.	131,749.99	0	131,749.99
Imperial Yarn Mills, Inc., McAdenville, N.C.	69,740.24	0	69,740.24	Spray Cotton Mills, Spray, N.C.	123,652.22	0	123,652.22
Ivey Weavers Plant No. 174, Hickory, N.C.	43,397.17	0	43,397.17	Sterling Cotton Mills, Inc., Franklinton, N.C.	127,528.76	0	127,528.76
J. D. Mills, Inc., Henderson, N.C.	51,211.67	64,013.56	115,225.23	Sterling Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C.	11,989.17	0	11,989.17
Johnston Manufacturing Co., Charlotte, N.C.	173,741.15	0	173,741.15	J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., Greenville, S.C.	0	889,835.52	889,835.52
Johnston Spinning Co., Monroe, N.C.	101,409.54	0	101,409.54	Stowe Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C.	122,229.11	0	122,229.11
Jordan Spinning Co., Saxapahaw, N.C.	52,457.73	0	52,457.73	Stowe Thread Co., Belmont, N.C.	34,961.73	0	34,961.73
Kasar Mills, Inc., Casar, N.C.	1,944.60	0	1,944.60	Superior Yarn Mills, Inc., Mount Holly, N.C.	113,129.10	0	113,129.10
Kindley Cotton Mill, Inc., Mt. Pleasant, N.C.	18,073.70	0	18,073.70	Textiles, Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	144,418.68	591,030.39	735,449.07
Kings Mountain Manufacturing Co., Kings Mountain, N.C.	21,784.28	0	21,784.28	Tolar, Hart & Holt Mill, Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	103,801.15	0	103,801.15
Kloppman Mills, Inc., Greensboro, N.C.	200,422.26	0	200,422.26	Travara Textiles, Inc., Graham, N.C.	62,434.96	21,600.66	84,035.62
Lilly Mills Co., Shelby, N.C.	12,888.84	0	12,888.84	Tuscarora Cotton Mill, Mount Pleasant, N.C.	33,995.31	0	33,995.31
Linford Mills, Inc., Belmont, N.C.	74,276.01	0	74,276.01	United Spinners Corp., Lowell, N.C.	1,213.03	0	1,213.03
Linn Mills Co., Inc., Landis, N.C.	142,112.93	0	142,112.93	United States Rubber Co., Gastonia, N.C.	82,389.83	0	82,389.83
Lions Club Industries for the Blind, Durham, N.C.	1,248.63	0	1,248.63	Valdese Manufacturing Co., Valdese, N.C.	94,501.47	0	94,501.47
Little Cotton Manufacturing Co., Wadesboro, N.C.	136,223.67	14,224.86	150,448.53	Virginia Mills, Inc., Swepsonville, N.C.	31,800.85	0	31,800.85
Long Shoals Cotton Mills, Inc., Lincoln, N.C.	56,743.95	0	56,743.95	Wade Manufacturing Co., Wadesboro, N.C.	139,952.60	0	139,952.60
R. C. G. Love Plant, Gastonia, N.C.	15,444.77	0	15,444.77	Washington Mills Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.	181,258.85	0	181,258.85
Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., Anderson, S.C.	44,187.26	168,909.83	213,097.09	Waverly Mills, Inc., Laurinburg, N.C.	3,278.14	0	3,278.14
Macanal Mills, Salisbury, N.C.	76,807.89	0	76,807.89	Wenonah Cotton Mills Co., Lexington, N.C.	53,251.56	0	53,251.56
Maestri Manufacturing Co., Belmont, N.C.	14,788.78	0	14,788.78	Wiscasset Mills Co., Albemarle, N.C.	490,973.59	156,765.44	647,739.03
Manetta Mills, Monroe, N.C.	39,323.76	0	39,323.76	Worth Spinning Co., Stony Point, N.C.	13,953.28	0	13,953.28
Marion Manufacturing Co., Marion, N.C.	61,538.67	0	61,538.67	Total	19,449,734.34	6,172,680.00	25,622,414.34
Marshall Mill No. 2, Charlotte, N.C.	40,332.36	0	40,332.36	OKLAHOMA			
Mauney Mills, Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C.	37,220.23	0	37,220.23	Oklahoma City, Mattress & Felt Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.	78.71	0	78.71
Moore Cotton Mill Co., Lenoir, N.C.	11,913.97	0	11,913.97	Oklahoma Bed Springs Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.	100.88	0	100.88
Mooresville Mills, Mooresville, N.C.	308,954.75	0	308,954.75	Total	179.59	0	179.59
Morehead Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C.	38,043.45	0	38,043.45	PENNSYLVANIA			
National Yarn Mills, Belmont, N.C.	123,743.61	0	123,743.61	Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., Manheim, Pa.	5,532.67	0	5,532.67
Oakboro Cotton Mills Co., Mount Pleasant, N.C.	12,738.70	0	12,738.70	Total	5,532.67	0	5,532.67
Oakdale Cotton Mills, Jamestown, N.C.	70,943.07	0	70,943.07	RHODE ISLAND			
J. M. Odell Manufacturing Co., Pittsboro, N.C.	58,506.10	0	58,506.10	Coats & Clark, Inc., Pawtucket, R.I.	26,008.25	0	26,008.25
Paola Cotton Mills, Inc., Statesville, N.C.	31,745.79	0	31,745.79	Berkshire-Hathaway, Inc., New Bedford, Mass.	79,981.90	0	79,981.90
Parkdale Mills, Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	198,540.41	70,927.61	269,468.02	Total	105,990.15	0	105,990.15
Park Yarn Mills Co., Kings Mountain, N.C.	45,737.31	0	45,737.31	SOUTH CAROLINA			
Peck Manufacturing Co., Gastonia, N.C.	73,287.62	0	73,287.62	Abney Mills, Greenwood, S.C.	235,644.87	929,597.55	1,165,242.42
Peerless Spinning Corp., Lowell, N.C.	13,117.05	0	13,117.05	Alice Manufacturing Co., Easley, S.C.	548,229.97	0	548,229.97
Perfection Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C.	55,865.28	0	55,865.28	American Thread Co., 260 West Broadway, New York, N.Y.	185,618.93	0	185,618.93
Phoenix No. 1 Plant, Kings Mountain, N.C.	200,402.53	0	200,402.53	Arkwright Mills, Spartanburg, S.C.	171,728.18	171,327.58	343,055.76
Phoenix No. 2 Plant, Lincolnton, N.C.	151,638.81	0	151,638.81	B. I. Cotton Mills, Calhoun Falls, S.C.	254,870.65	0	254,870.65
Pickett Cotton Mills, Inc., High Point, N.C.	107,212.03	0	107,212.03	B. I. Cotton Mills, Cherokee Falls, S.C.	101,454.72	0	101,454.72
Piedmont Processing Co., Belmont, N.C.	86,010.72	0	86,010.72	B. I. Cotton Mills, Valley Falls, S.C.	85,411.16	0	85,411.16
Pilot Mills Co., Raleigh, N.C.	53,843.13	0	53,843.13	Bamberg Textile Mills, Bamberg, S.C.	64,480.96	0	64,480.96
H. K. Porter Co., Inc., Charlotte, N.C.	2,060.42	0	2,060.42	Beacon Manufacturing Co., Swannanoa, N.C.	60,767.85	0	60,767.85
Quaker Meadows Mills, Inc., Hickory, N.C.	37,398.58	0	37,398.58	Blair Mills, Inc., Belton, S.C.	75,925.51	0	75,925.51
Randolph Mills, Inc., Concord, N.C.	79,922.04	0	79,922.04	Blanche Cotton Mills, Augusta, Ga.	20,988.69	0	20,988.69
Randolph Mills, Inc., Franklinville, N.C.	118,988.40	0	118,988.40	Bowling Green Spinning Co., Gastonia, N.C.	61,203.53	0	61,203.53
Rhodes-Whitener Mills, Inc., Taylorsville, N.C.	39,782.98	0	39,782.98	Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C.	137,853.16	44,446.61	182,299.77
D. E. Rhyne Mills, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C.	5,843.48	0	5,843.48	Catlin Farish Co., Batesburg, S.C.	152,791.21	0	152,791.21
Roberts Manufacturing Co., Concord, N.C.	55,477.24	18,147.61	73,624.85	Cheraw Cotton Mills, Inc., Cheraw, S.C.	129,878.96	0	129,878.96
Robinson Mills, Inc., Gastonia, N.C.	105,489.27	0	105,489.27	Chiopee Manufacturing Co., 501 George Street, New Brunswick, N.J.	149,425.05	0	149,425.05
Rockfish-Mebane Yarn Mills, Inc., Chattanooga, Tenn.	181,086.92	0	181,086.92	Clifton Manufacturing Co., Clifton, S.C.	551,797.26	0	551,797.26
Rocky Mount Cord Co., Rocky Mount, N.C.	655.38	0	655.38				
Rocky Mount Mills, Rocky Mount, N.C.	362,591.31	0	362,591.31				
Rowan Cotton Mills Co., Salisbury, N.C.	123,631.48	0	123,631.48				
Roxboro Cotton Mills, Roxboro, N.C.	275,092.71	0	275,092.71				
Royal Cotton Mill Co., Saxapahaw, N.C.	81,422.63	0	81,422.63				

Individual interim payments during the period Apr. 11–July 31, 1964—Continued

Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total	Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total
SOUTH CAROLINA—continued				TENNESSEE—continued			
Clinton Cotton Mills, Clinton, S.C.	\$267,123.99	\$93,930.65	\$361,054.64	Dixie Mercerizing Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.	\$205,831.92	0	\$205,831.92
Cone Mills Corp., Greensboro, N.C.	106,249.32	0	106,249.32	Dyersburg Cotton Products, Inc., Dyersburg, Tenn.	125,163.47	0	125,163.47
Drayton Mill, Spartanburg, S.C.	34,548.47	42,181.35	76,729.82	Elk Cotton Mills, Fayetteville, Tenn.	88,028.06	0	88,028.06
Firestone Textiles, Bennettsville, S.C.	49,010.25	0	49,010.25	Rockford Manufacturing Co., Rockford, Tenn.	57,302.62	0	57,302.62
Franklin Process Co., Greenville, S.C.	51,632.54	0	51,632.54	Standard-Coosa-Thatcher Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.	72,942.03	\$73,691.47	146,633.50
Gaffney Manufacturing Co., Gaffney, S.C.	49,018.84	235,018.80	284,037.64	Standard Knitting Mills, Inc., Knoxville, Tenn.	194,685.12	0	194,685.12
Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C.	279,395.27	1,102,216.40	1,381,611.67	Tennessee Line & Twine Co., Elizabethton, Tenn.	6,651.83	0	6,651.83
Greenwood Mills, Greenwood, S.C.	1,045,156.89	0	1,045,156.89	Trenton Mills, Inc., Trenton, Tenn.	29,767.45	0	29,767.45
Greer Manufacturing Co., Easley, S.C.	51,161.88	0	51,161.88	Werthan Bag Corp., Nashville, Tenn.	185,876.20	0	185,876.20
Hamer Spinning Mills, Hamer, S.C.	60,168.93	0	60,168.93	Total	1,361,940.29	396,098.80	1,758,039.09
Hamrick Mills, Gaffney, S.C.	19,896.56	78,064.08	97,960.64				
Hartsville Mill, Hartsville, S.C.	13,700.18	65,146.44	78,846.62	TEXAS			
Hermiteage Cotton Mills, Camden, S.C.	101,072.13	0	101,072.13	Brenham Cotton Mill, Inc., Brenham, Tex.	127,199.47	57,878.86	185,078.33
Highland Park Manufacturing Co., Rock Hill, S.C.	82,618.05	0	82,618.05	B. I. Cotton Mills, West, Tex.	41,902.49	0	41,902.49
Inman Mills, Inman, S.C.	123,634.80	491,786.53	615,421.33	Corsicana Cotton Mills, Corsicana, Tex.	45,235.57	0	45,235.57
Jackson Mills, Wellford, S.C.	398,455.12	0	398,455.12	Central Texas Development Co., Inc., West, Tex.	7,911.73	0	7,911.73
Joanna Cotton Mills Co., Joanna, S.C.	272,347.20	0	272,347.20	Coastal Pickery, Inc., Galveston, Tex.	287.75	0	287.75
Joint Research Prototype Mill, Spartanburg, S.C.	39,504.14	61,590.62	101,094.76	Denison Cotton Mill Co., Denison, Tex.	146,212.82	0	146,212.82
Judson Mills, Greenville, S.C.	16,581.69	65,693.67	82,275.36	Houston Cotton Mills Co., Houston, Tex.	31,925.58	0	31,925.58
Kendall Co., Box 1828, Charlotte, N.C.	195,392.40	784,501.59	979,893.99	Houston Textile Co., Houston, Tex.	0	52,984.80	52,984.80
Kenneth Cotton Mills, Walhalla, S.C.	37,805.75	0	37,805.75	Walter Hogg Cotton Industries, Inc., Dallas, Tex.	808.07	0	808.07
Lockhart Mill, Lockhart, S.C.	126,351.87	162,280.68	288,632.55	Hillsboro Cotton Mills, Hillsboro, Tex.	26,931.69	0	26,931.69
Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., Anderson, S.C.	364,124.91	1,354,305.32	1,718,430.23	Ralph Leggett Cotton Co., Houston, Tex.	165.68	0	165.68
Lydia Cotton Mills, Clinton, S.C.	179,435.36	63,665.16	243,100.52	Lone Star Textiles, Inc., Hallettsville, Tex.	78,292.94	0	78,292.94
Mackintosh Spinning Mill, Inc., Clover, S.C.	33,187.55	0	33,187.55	Lone Star Textiles, Inc., Mexia, Tex.	126,466.53	0	126,466.53
Manetta Mills, Inc., Lando, S.C.	2,034.82	0	2,034.82	Mission Valley Mills, Inc., New Braunfels, Tex.	131,662.43	47,678.08	179,340.51
Mass Mohair Plush Co., Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C.	23,785.96	0	23,785.96	Postex Cotton Mills, Post, Tex.	110,209.70	0	110,209.70
Mayfair Mills, Arcadia, S.C.	609,777.84	0	609,777.84	Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Lubbock, Tex.	190.97	0	190.97
Monarch Mill, Union, S.C.	230,045.65	273,496.14	503,541.79	Plainview Mattress Factory, Plainview, Tex.	468.96	0	468.96
Mount Vernon Mills, Inc., 201 East Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Md.	475,825.58	0	475,825.58	Red River Cotton Mills, Inc., Bonham, Tex.	88,206.49	0	88,206.49
Musgrove Mills, Gaffney, S.C.	14,978.60	58,608.67	73,587.27	Sherman Manufacturing Co., Sherman, Tex.	219,517.08	0	219,517.08
Newberry Mills, Inc., Newberry, S.C.	142,372.03	0	142,372.03	Standoe Brake Lining Co., Houston, Tex.	1,144.32	0	1,144.32
Orange Cotton Mills, Orangeburg, S.C.	38,133.73	0	38,133.73	Sinclair Bedding Co., Waco, Tex.	118.95	0	118.95
Pacolet Mill, Pacolet Mills, S.C.	162,221.08	189,224.75	351,445.83	Texas Department of Corrections Textile Mill, Huntsville, Tex.	18,322.84	0	18,322.84
Pacolet Yarns, Greenville, S.C.	58,485.37	65,303.67	123,789.04	Texas Textile Mills, Inc., McKinney, Tex.	241,016.29	0	241,016.29
Parke, Davis & Co., Greenwood, S.C.	7,586.14	0	7,586.14	Waco Mattress Co., Waco, Tex.	36.40	0	36.40
F. W. Poe Manufacturing Co., Greenville, S.C.	147,653.79	0	147,653.79	Total	1,444,234.75	158,541.74	1,602,776.49
Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., North Charleston, S.C.	5,460.84	0	5,460.84				
Reeves Bros. Inc., Spartanburg, S.C.	342,216.13	0	342,216.13	VIRGINIA			
Riegel Textile Corp., Ware Shoals, S.C.	549,299.77	0	549,299.77	Dan River Mills, Inc., Danville, Va.	0	1,593,303.78	1,593,303.78
S. C. Cotton Mills, Orangeburg, S.C.	86,001.42	0	86,001.42	Feldcrest Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C.	96,890.95	100,762.41	197,653.36
Scotland Mills, Inc., Lancaster, S.C.	136,204.56	0	136,204.56	Halifax Cotton Mills, Inc., South Boston, Va.	32,999.47	0	32,999.47
Spartan Mills, Spartanburg, S.C.	1,122,060.26	0	1,122,060.26	Industrial Department, the Penitentiary, Richmond, Va.	5,361.08	0	5,361.08
The Springs Cotton Mills, Lancaster, S.C.	3,780,297.40	0	3,780,297.40	Washington Mills Co., Fries, Va.	349,931.53	0	349,931.53
J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., Box 1209, Greenville, S.C.	0	2,650,133.52	2,650,133.52	Total	485,183.03	1,694,066.19	2,179,249.22
Townsend Cotton Mill, Anderson, S.C.	10,171.19	0	10,171.19				
Division of United Merchants & Manufacturers, Bath, S.C.	32,723.34	121,507.03	154,230.37				
Division of United Merchants & Manufacturers, Buffalo, S.C.	58,580.19	308,762.08	367,348.27				
Division of United Merchants & Manufacturers, Union, S.C.	6,122.67	40,752.92	46,875.59				
U.S. Rubber Co., Winnsboro, S.C.	148,881.19	0	148,881.19				
West Point Manufacturing Co., Box 71, West Point, Ga.	34,720.07	185,617.30	220,337.37				
Woodside Mills, Greenville, S.C.	0	1,126,922.73	1,126,922.73				
Total	15,211,290.37	10,766,081.84	25,977,372.21				
TENNESSEE							
Bemis Bro. Bag Co., Bemis, Tenn.	285,699.89	0	285,699.89				
J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc.—Borden Plant, Greenville, S.C.	0	322,407.33	322,407.33				
Cherokee Textile Mills, Sevierville, Tenn.	109,991.70	0	109,991.70				

HOW DID THE CONSUMERS FARE?

The latest cotton situation report, official bulletin of the U.S. Department of Agriculture—CS-215, page 9—reports:

Cloth prices are slightly higher. The average wholesale value of fabric (20 constructions) made from a pound of cotton in October was 61.25 cents per pound compared with 61.02 cents in September and 61.34 a year earlier.

Here is today's Wall Street Journal commodity price quotations. They show the comparison with a year ago, before the multi-million-dollar payments to textile mills were begun:

CASH PRICES: FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 1965
(Quotations as of 4 p.m., eastern time)

Textiles and fibers

	Friday	Thursday	Year ago
Cotton, 1-inch middling, Memphis.....pound	0.3025	0.3025	0.3325
Print cloth:			
64 by 60, 38½-inch, New York.....yard	.16	.16	.14½
80 by 80, 39-inch, New York.....do	.20¼	.20¼	.19
Sheatings, 56 by 60, 40-inch, New York.....do	.19¼	.19¼	.19½
Burlap, 10-ounce, 40-inch, New York.....do	.1320a	.1320	.1195
Wool, fine staple territory, Boston.....pound	1.30	1.30	1.41
Wool tops, New York.....do	1.655n	1.655	1.845
Rayon, satin acetate, New York.....yard	.28n	.28	.27

Textile unions which a year ago supported the cotton bill now call it a bonanza for the mills.

The administration assurances that the mill subsidies would yield rich re-

turns for the consumers have not been fulfilled.

Yes, this is why the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLEN-

DER], who are the ranking member and chairman of the other body's Agriculture and Forestry Committee, have expressed such deep doubt about the cotton program.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 17, page 22000, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] says:

This subsidy will amount to some \$300-\$400 million this first year.

In other words, it would have paid us better to have bought all these imports coming in from foreign countries and given them to the people of the underdeveloped countries of the world and we would still have saved some money.

At page 20001 of the RECORD of the same date, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] said:

My study of the cost figures revealed that actual expenditures under the new cotton law would amount to \$753 million. * * * And, as a matter of fact, it is considerably more than the cost of the program under the 1958 law.

I would also draw to the attention of the House the fact that Secretary Freeman has reduced by 1 penny a pound the CCC loan level on the 1965 crop, an action which will affect the income of every cottongrower in the Nation.

I commend the Secretary for this action, but regret that he did not take a similar action each year he has headed the Department. Had he done so—and he had ample authority—cotton would have today been on a sound road and taxpayers would have millions more in their pockets.

It is noteworthy that the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the new subsidies going to textile mills must be treated as income for tax purposes.

An item in the Wall Street Journal of January 15, 1965, reported as follows:

Payments voted by Congress in the 1964 farm law must be counted promptly by U.S. mills as taxable income, the IRS ruled. The payments of 6½ cents a pound to cotton handlers are aimed at keeping the fiber from being more costly to domestic than to export mills. Some cotton users wanted the payments, which can be either in cotton or in cash, to be treated as reducing their cotton inventory values, in which case the amounts involved usually wouldn't be subject to tax until the goods were sold. But the IRS held the recipients generally must treat the payments as "other income" in the year in which the Agriculture Department approves their applications for the subsidies.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the House should understand very clearly today why it is going to be asked tomorrow to put up millions of extra dollars to pay for the cotton program. Millions of dollars more, I might add, than was originally budgeted for fiscal year 1965.

After I complained earlier today in a speech on the House floor that copies of the Appropriations Committee hearings on the supplemental bill would not be ready for examination until 2 hours before the House convenes tomorrow, the distinguished chairman of the Committee, the Honorable GEORGE MAHON of Texas, saw to it that I was provided with an advance proof of the hearings.

For that, I am grateful, as it enables me to refer you directly from official

sources as to why we are now called upon to pay the piper for last year's cotton folly. I invite your attention to the hearings, which will doubtless be available during consideration of the bill tomorrow. See statements on these pages: 7, 12, 15, 24, 28, 29, 33, 38-39, and 41.

KERMIT GORDON STIRS UP A STORM

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it will be surprising if Budget Director Kermit Gordon ever again ventures from statistical seclusion to discuss Federal farm programs.

In the January 9 issue of Saturday Review magazine, Mr. Gordon made some mild observations about the cost and results of farm programs, noted they originated back in the 1930's as welfare measures and suggested they be reviewed in the light of today's circumstances. It stirred up a storm of critical comment, most of it from Mr. Gordon's side of the political aisle.

Most of what he wrote about farms and farming was mild, factual, and restrained—information readily available to every student of the subject. He noted, for example, that most of the money spent for farm programs does not trickle down to the low-income farmers but goes to relatively successful commercial farmers.

Those who have been reading my rather steady commentary on the wheat certificate program will recognize this as a familiar theme. I have pointed out, for example, that the big boys, 1,300 giant wheatgrowers, qualify for average annual payments of \$15,000 a year, while the small wheatgrowers—those in the 12- to 15-acre category, and there are more than a million of them—qualify for average annual payments of only \$58.

But back to Mr. Gordon's predicament. About all Mr. Gordon did was to air some long-known truths. He said farm programs "are no longer a means of distributing income to the neediest groups in our population; they are not welfare programs. From a welfare standpoint, the chief claimants to assistance are the 2,500,000 farmers who do not now and cannot in the future be expected to operate successful commercial farms."

In this comment, Mr. Gordon was, in my opinion, unduly pessimistic. If freed from the shackles of bureaucratic regulation, U.S. agriculture can win such expanding markets that many of these farmers who are now marginal will find solid opportunity on the farm. Whether that happens depends in great measure on whether Congress acts promptly to give the farmer the freedom he needs and deserves. Under present governmental handicaps, these 2½ million

farmers probably do face the bleak future painted by Mr. Gordon.

In any event, Mr. Gordon does not deserve to be blasted for wanting to drive 2½ million farmers off the land.

Mr. Gordon made the valid and important point that much of American agriculture is relatively healthy and the Federal Government should stop using welfare gimmicks on that part of it.

He also took note of the influence of compensatory payments that have, as he puts it, "crept" into our system.

I commend particularly his statement on this point:

Now if there is any one principle of economics that economists of every persuasion would accept, it is that the price system is an exceptionally useful mechanism both for conserving a scarce resource and for allocating it to uses with the greatest value.

I hope the people drafting farm legislation proposals soon to come to Capitol Hill will keep this excellent time-tested principle in mind.

This is probably too much to hope for, as Mr. Gordon has been verbally whipped from pillar to post for making observations such as that in the Saturday Review piece.

The inconsistencies of agricultural legislation must drive good economists crazy.

Take a look at the first farm bill launched by President Johnson, the wheat-cotton bill of 1964. In the very same legislative package he put a multi-million-dollar payment bonanza benefiting textile mills and a multimillion-dollar processing tax handicapping flour mills; on one hand, a scheme to reduce raw material costs to cotton processors, and on the other, one to increase raw material costs to wheat processors; one of these—cotton—financed by general tax revenues, and the other—wheat—financed by what may be the most regressive excise fee in history, fittingly described as a tax on poor people.

Other inconsistencies have been with us for years.

As Mr. Gordon pointed out, taxpayers spend millions of dollars to take land out of production, hoping this will balance supply and demand, and spend other millions to put new land into production. The cost of some of the land reclamation and irrigation projects, heavily subsidized by taxpayers, ranges as high as \$1,500 an acre.

If responsible officials like Mr. Gordon are to be bloodied up every time they attempt to discuss farm programs, can we reasonably expect ever to pull the American taxpayer—farmers are taxpayers too—out of the costly muck and mire churned up in the Capitol Hill legislative mill during the last 30 years?

A responsible dialog on farm programs should be encouraged, not discouraged. Some of the programs have become so complex they seem to defy understanding.

It is high time for a thorough discussion, debate, and delineation of their nature and effect. Such would be helpful to farmers and all other Americans.

Mr. Gordon's article is a hopeful beginning.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET CAN BE CUT

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. Pelly. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's 1966 budget request asks new obligational authority of \$103 billion. In addition, the President says later he will ask for an additional \$3 billion. The total is estimated as \$106 billion, so no one should be misled into believing this is a \$99.7 billion budget.

That \$99.7 billion figure is for the consumption of those who urged Mr. Johnson to hold his budget under \$100 billion.

As for the statement of the President in his message, that public debt is not a drain on national resources because it is mostly owed to ourselves, that is more of the same old brainwash we have been hearing for years. The \$11 billion interest alone of our national debt averages \$222 per household and that is a drain on every family in America.

The President may have cut out funds to purchase a few new filing cabinets and maybe a few light bulbs, but I am confident that Congress can make substantial cuts on his budget without hurting anyone.

THE CONTINUING BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in spite of numerous actions which have been taken to eliminate the chronic balance-of-payments problem, the United States continues to run a heavy deficit and no solution to the problem is in sight under current policies.

The deficit on regular transactions in 1964 is now estimated at \$2.5 million. This is some improvement over the previous years but far from satisfactory. Even more disturbing is the fact that experts on the balance of payments expect little or no improvement this year. When one recalls that Secretary Dillon told the Joint Economic Committee several years ago that deficits of this magnitude could not be permitted to continue much longer, there appears to be cause for real concern.

The continuing deficit as well as the sharp increase in our money supply in recent years have all combined to put renewed pressure on our gold stock. While the gold drain in 1964 was small by the standards of the past several years, opinion is widespread that the gold outflow will accelerate sharply this year. It has been said in the press that some administration officials believe the gold

outflow may run from \$500 million to \$1 billion. If this occurs, combined with the expected increase in Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities, the so-called free gold available to meet potential foreign claims will shrink near the vanishing point.

In spite of such regressive measures as the interest equalization tax and numerous other palliatives and gimmicks which the administration has devised to buy time we have not used this time to attack the basic causes of the problem. We are still in the position where our continuing balance of payments and gold problems could result in the collapse of the international monetary system unless basic and effective remedial action is taken in the near future. In fact the cost of buying the time we have squandered has put us in a worse position. This may involve some hard and unpleasant choices, such as a reexamination of U.S. foreign and military outlays overseas. But we must remember that the health of the world financial system is at stake and that any collapse of that system would create new and serious problems of unemployment and deflation here at home.

Last July Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and JACK MILLER and myself, as members of the Joint Economic Committee, in a resolution introduced in the House and Senate, recommended that the United States initiate discussions within the International Monetary Fund designed to strengthen the international monetary system. While such discussion, particularly involving the adequacy of both present and future supplies of international liquidity, were conducted by both the IMF and the so-called group of 10 major industrial powers, the practical results of those studies have been inadequate in the face of the problems before us.

For this reason my colleagues and I in the Senate, as well as Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, ranking minority member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and member of the Joint Economic Committee, are again introducing a resolution dealing with our balance-of-payments deficit.

The resolution declares the intent of Congress that the elimination of the payments deficit should receive top priority by the administration, that the maintenance of the balance-of-payments equilibrium should be a continuing and major goal of our economic policy, that the world monetary and credit mechanism should be strengthened and that the United States should press for an international economic conference to discuss urgent economic world problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be included in the RECORD at this point.

H. CON. RES. 127

Whereas the United States has had a deficit in its international balance of payments every year, except one, since 1950; and

Whereas, largely as a result of these deficits, United States short-term dollar liabilities to foreigners totaled an estimated \$27,976,000,000 at the end of October 1964; and

Whereas these liabilities constitute a potential claim against the United States gold stock of \$15,200,000,000, of which less than

\$1,400,000,000 is "free gold" not required to serve as backing for our currency; and

Whereas the health of our domestic economy and strength of the dollar and its ability to serve as a key international reserve currency depends upon the early elimination of the balance-of-payments deficit and the creation of improved arrangements to serve the liquidity needs for an expanding international trade and payments system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that achievement of balance-of-payments equilibrium in a manner consistent with the dollar's role as a key international reserve currency should receive the highest priority in the formation of national economic policy, and be it further

Resolved, That the maintenance of equilibrium in its international accounts should be a continuing and major goal of United States international economic policy; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States take the initiative to devise new and improved methods of permanently strengthening the international monetary and credit mechanism in order to provide (a) improved means of financing balance-of-payments deficits until basic corrective forces restore equilibrium, and (b) sufficient liquidity to finance future increases in world trade and payments; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be required to call for an International Economic Conference to review the long-term adequacy of international credit; to recommend needed changes in existing financial institutions; to consider increased sharing of economic aid for development and military assistance; and to consider other pressing international economic problems placed before it by a preparatory committee for such Conference.

WHO IS INTERESTED IN INTEREST?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, much discussion of monetary policy, and the concern of public policy with respect to interest rates, seems to emphasize the cost or payment aspect of interest and interest rates. This concern tends to neglect the fact that for every interest payment or interest cost there is elsewhere in the economy an interest-received item or interest-income aspect.

This one-sided concern probably results from the fact that most homeowners and businessmen are more aware and reminded of the monthly payments coming due on mortgages and notes payable than they are of their share in the interest income which accrues to them on life insurance policies, pension incomes, savings bonds and accounts, or other interest-bearing holdings. The interposition of these financial intermediaries between the individual as a debtor who must pay interest, and the same individual as a creditor who benefits indirectly from interest received, may be the reason why the cost aspect tends to be emphasized and the income aspect overlooked. We tend to think primarily about higher interest costs and forget,

for example, that the recent high rates on savings accounts mean increased income to savers—often the same persons who pay interest—and help to generate savings which in turn become available to finance home mortgages and businesses. This same situation involving intermediaries and differences between credit obligations and equity positions makes it difficult for us to balance the two quantities of first, who pays interest on the one hand; and second, who receives this interest on the other hand.

A table in the Federal Reserve Bulletin of October 1964 giving the sector statement of "financial" assets and liabilities throws some light on this subject. It is not argued on the basis of the table that interest payments or interest income are precisely proportionate to these "financial" liabilities or assets since interest rates may differ from contract to contract and, indeed, some assets or liabilities carry no interest charges at all.

It is noteworthy from the table, however, that "households" own more than twice as many financial assets as those which they owe. Interest earnings credited to or received by households are presumably of a magnitude nearly double the interest paid. It is significant, too, but not surprising, that the interest-earning assets and the deposits of commercial banks, not all of which bear interest of course, are substantially the same amount. Principal debtors, on balance, are governments and nonfinancial businesses.

Sector statement of selected financial assets and liabilities,¹ Dec. 31, 1963

(In billions of dollars)

	Assets (interest earning) ¹	Liabilities (interest cost) ¹
Households.....	\$694.1	\$269.2
Farms.....	7.1	29.7
Business (nonfinancial).....	254.5	362.6
Commercial banks.....	262.4	258.8
Savings and loan associations.....	107.4	100.2
Mutual savings banks.....	49.7	44.6
Life insurance companies.....	133.8	116.9
Other insurance companies.....	25.8	-----
Pension funds (noninsured).....	23.1	-----
Finance companies.....	36.2	27.0
Brokers and open-end investment companies.....	13.0	8.0
U.S. Government.....	77.4	295.0
State and local governments.....	69.0	121.4
Rest of world.....	34.8	29.5

¹ Estimated amounts involving interest payments or receipts (in the case of demand deposits for service and availability costs). Corporate stocks, direct investments of foreigners in U.S. gold stocks, etc., although "financial assets" have been excluded.

Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin, October 1964, pp. 1343-1348.

DEFINING POVERTY: THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSIDERING POTENTIAL INCOME FROM ASSETS

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in attempting to identify those who are living in poverty the administration has set an

annual money income of \$3,000 as the poverty line. Critics of this definition have pointed out that a family's assets, the number of children and their ages, the area of the country in which they live and many other nonincome factors should be considered before a family can be said to be poverty-stricken.

A recent Government study conducted by the Social Security Administration and discussed in the December 1964 issue of the Social Security Bulletin dramatically illustrates the effect on income of persons and families aged 65 and over, if the assets of such persons were converted to income prorated over the expected life of the holder.

Under this system, the median income of aged couples rises from \$2,875 to \$3,795 annually with assets, including home equity, prorated over the expected life of the couple. Excluding home equity, the median would rise to \$3,130. Prorating all assets, the percentage of aged couples with income levels under \$3,000 falls from 54 percent of the total of such couples to 35 percent of the total.

The type of analysis contained in this study is vital if the poverty program is going to achieve its objectives. In the case of the aged population, supplementary sources of income not considered under the administration's definition are especially important and may significantly enhance the well-being of an aged couple or individual.

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to, entitled "Potential Income From Assets: Findings of the 1963 Survey of the Aged," and prepared by Janet Murray be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

POTENTIAL INCOME FROM ASSETS: FINDINGS OF THE 1963 SURVEY OF THE AGED

(By Janet Murray¹)

If the assets of all persons in the United States aged 65 and over could be converted to income prorated over the expected life of the holder, the median income for aged couples in 1962, with equity in the home excluded, would be raised from \$2,875 to \$3,130. The median would be raised from \$1,365 to \$1,560 for nonmarried men and from \$1,015 to \$1,130 for nonmarried women.

Such an addition of distributed assets to income would increase the inequality of the income distribution. It would still leave more than a third of the couples and about two-thirds of the nonmarried with insufficient income to live independently at the modest but adequate budget of standards developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

It has long been recognized that, although current money income is the customary and certainly the best single measure of the economic situation of any population group, supplementary resources may be especially important for the aged. Assets, inheritances, and other occasional money receipts not classified as income, the informal transfers to income that occur when the elderly share living arrangements with relatives, food that is homegrown or received as a gift or in lieu of wages—all these resources may significantly enhance the well-being of an aged couple or individual.

Detailed information from the 1963 Survey of the Aged, conducted by the Social Security Administration, on the size and sources of the income of the aged and on

the size and composition of their asset holdings has been published in previous articles.²

The objective of this article is to focus on a measurement that combines data on the income and assets of the survey units, as well as their age and sex. This measurement has been called potential income. It involves an arbitrary proration of assets, plus earned interest, over the expected life of the survey units. Although this is a statistical construct, it serves as a convenient device for grouping together units having approximately the same economic position when both income and assets are considered and thus for showing how the size distribution of current money income would be altered with assets taken into account in this way.

Lump-sum life insurance and other payments—inheritorships, gifts, tax refunds, back pay, awards for injury or damage—that are classified as current income may be large indeed for a few individuals (the inheritance of a "wealthy widow," for example), but they cannot be considered as a resource for the great majority. In 1962 only about 5 percent of the units aged 65 and over had any receipts of this kind. Food received without direct expense is a supplementary resource for a larger number of units and may be of special importance to those with very low incomes, but in general the value of such food is small. Living with relatives may improve the economic situation of the aged in some cases; in others, it is of mutual advantage or may benefit the younger members. The limited information on the financial aspects of such living arrangements that can be derived from a cross-tabulation of the money income of the older units by income of all members in the family group is currently being analyzed.

POTENTIAL INCOME—CONCEPT AND MEASUREMENT

In order to express the economic position of units with any combination of income and asset holdings and to group the units with broadly equivalent positions, "income with prorated assets"—in other words, potential income—was computed for each unit. The following procedure was used:

Assets were assumed to be capable of earning a 4-percent annual rate of return. The principal and the appropriate interest amounts were divided over the expected remaining years of the unit's life in equal annual sums so that the assets would be exhausted at the end of that period. The annual amount computed in this way was added to the current money income less income actually received from assets.³ For couples, proration was based on a joint probability: the number of years of life remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw two-thirds of the annual portion of asset holdings previously available to the couple.⁴ In a few cases—usually those in the lower end of the age range, or couples who had assets other than equity in a home—the actual return was greater than the 4 percent

² The income of the aged was reported in the Bulletin for March 1964, work experience and earnings in the June 1964 issue, and assets in the November 1964 issue.

³ The amounts that were subtracted were interest on deposits in banks, credit unions, etc.; interest or dividends on stocks and bonds; and 4 percent of any amounts reported as invested in a business or farm.

⁴ The factors needed in the computation were developed by the Division of the Actuary. The U.S. Life Tables for 1959 were used in determining life expectancies by age and sex. For simplicity in calculation for married couples, the wife was arbitrarily assumed to be 5 years younger than the husband and the joint life expectancies were computed on that basis.

¹ Division of Research and Statistics. John Labovitz assisted in the analysis.

used in the computation, and the prorated amount of assets added was less than the amount subtracted.

The adoption of these procedures, although in effect assuming the conversion of assets into life annuities, does not in any way bear upon the question of the feasibility or the desirability of this form of asset management for individuals. The advisability of such conversion would, indeed, be subject to many conditions and considerations important for the individuals involved. The conversion of the owned farm or other business holdings into prorated assets, for example, is recognized as particularly unrealistic. However, in order to achieve the objective of measuring equivalence of economic status within broad population groups, such assets have been included.

As an illustration of the concept and measurement of potential income, some questions may be raised, and answered, about groups of individuals with different combinations of income and assets. It would be generally agreed that persons with incomes of, say, \$1,500 and asset holdings of \$10,000 are better off than those with the same income and no assets. But would they be better off than others with an income of \$2,000 and with \$1,000 in assets? If these persons were all nonmarried women aged 65 and were currently receiving a 4-percent return from their assets, all would have about the same potential income—actual income minus the income from assets plus prorated assets—of slightly more than \$2,000. For those with \$10,000 in assets, \$900 of this amount would be income from prorated assets. If the latter group were aged 85 instead of 65, the potential income would be appreciably greater—about \$3,600, with more than \$2,500 from prorated assets.

An owned home, unlike other assets, is not normally acquired as a source of future money income or as a reserve for contingencies but rather for the services and satisfaction it yields as a place of family living. Accordingly, potential income has been calculated both including and excluding home

equity among the assets prorated. For many purposes it may be more reasonable and realistic to exclude the owned home from prorated assets, especially since sale of the home would increase the need for income to cover rental costs. Such costs tend to run higher than the expense of ownership, particularly for the large group of the elderly who own their homes clear of mortgage.

The distributions of couples and of nonmarried men and women aged 65 and over by level of potential income and the median amount of such income are compared with the distributions of the same groups by level of actual income. Comparisons are presented for beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance (OASDI) program and for nonbeneficiaries, for three age groups. A cross-tabulation of units by actual income and by income with prorated assets other than owned homes provides information on the proportions of units whose potential income is considerably higher than or about the same as their actual income. Finally, the income with prorated assets other than the owned home of units with no income from earnings is reviewed. Those units who are receiving income from earnings may still be increasing their asset holdings. Those who no longer have such income are more likely to be drawing upon assets previously acquired. An understanding of the potential income of this group seems of special interest.

COMPARISON OF POTENTIAL AND ACTUAL INCOME

When the distributions of survey units by actual and potential income shown in table 1 are compared, they appear to be remarkably similar. When the comparison is based upon income with prorated assets other than the home, the differences that do exist usually amount to only 1 or 2 percentage points at any income interval. Differences are definitely larger when the owned home is included in the prorated assets. An indication of the shifts in the distributions may be obtained through a comparison of the medians for units aged 65 and over, shown below.

Type of unit	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	
		Excluding home equity	Including home equity
Married couples.....	\$2,875	\$3,130	\$3,795
Nonmarried men.....	1,365	1,560	1,845
Nonmarried women.....	1,015	1,130	1,395

Although the median potential income is about 10 percent greater than actual income when home equity is excluded and a little more than 30 percent greater when home equity is included, these shifts in the medians do not indicate the amounts that prorated assets would add in the aggregate to current income. The distributions of potential income are even more skewed to the right than are the distributions of current income, and the inequalities in the distributions are increased.

The greater shift in the distribution when equity in the home is included among the assets reflects the importance of such equity, and the extent of homeownership, as a major form of assets among aged persons with relatively low incomes.

Another way of relating potential to actual income is to compare the percentages of units at less than a given level. It has been estimated that \$2,500 in 1962 would have permitted a retired couple to live independently at the BLS "modest but adequate" budget standard. About 42 percent of the couples had actual income of less than \$2,500. Thirty-six percent had less than \$2,500 if prorated assets excluding the owned home were added to income. It is not appropriate to relate to this benchmark the proportion of couples with less than \$2,500 in potential income when the equity in the owned home is prorated because the \$2,500 cost estimate assumes that a majority of units own their homes. If all units are assumed to rent their homes the cost of the "modest but adequate" budget would be higher.

TABLE 1.—Size of income, actual ¹ and with prorated assets (excluding and including equity in nonfarm home),² for units aged 65 and over—Percentage distribution, by income level, 1962

Income level	Married couples			Nonmarried men			Nonmarried women		
	Actual income	Income with prorated assets		Actual income	Income with prorated assets		Actual income	Income with prorated assets	
		Excluding equity in home	Including equity in home		Excluding equity in home	Including equity in home		Excluding equity in home	Including equity in home
Number (in thousands):									
Total.....	5,445	5,445	5,445	2,402	2,402	2,402	6,329	6,329	6,329
Reporting on specified income ³	4,719	4,337	4,337	2,173	2,063	2,063	5,536	5,086	5,085
Total percent.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Less than \$1,000.....	5	4	3	32	28	25	49	45	36
\$1,000 to \$1,499.....	10	9	6	25	20	18	21	21	18
\$1,500 to \$1,999.....	14	12	8	12	11	13	13	13	13
\$2,000 to \$2,499.....	13	11	9	11	12	11	7	6	8
\$2,500 to \$2,999.....	12	12	9	5	6	7	3	4	6
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	16	18	18	6	6	8	3	4	7
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....	11	10	11	3	5	6	1	2	4
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	15	18	26	6	8	11	3	3	5
\$10,000 and over.....	5	7	9	1	3	5	(4)	2	2
Median: ⁵									
All units.....	\$2,875	\$3,130	\$3,795	\$1,365	\$1,560	\$1,845	\$1,015	\$1,130	\$1,395
OASDI beneficiaries.....	2,800	3,020	3,685	1,405	1,640	1,960	1,225	1,330	1,630
Nonbeneficiaries.....	3,580	3,835	4,585	1,145	1,325	1,560	755	815	960

¹ Total money income in 1962.

² Actual income less income from assets plus the portion of asset holdings that would have been available for spending annually if all assets were prorated over the average remaining years of life of the unit, with a 4-percent annual return. Sex differentials in longevity included in computation. For couples, proration based on joint probability of the number of years remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw ¼ of asset holdings available to couple annually.

³ Data on actual income based on information for those survey units reporting amount

of money income received in 1962. Data on income with prorated assets based on information for those survey units reporting both amount of money income in 1962 and amount of assets at the end of 1962. Median actual income of those reporting on both income and assets would probably be about the same for married couples, slightly higher for nonmarried men, and slightly lower for nonmarried women.

⁴ Less than 0.5 percent.

⁵ Computed from \$500 income groupings.

For an individual living alone, the estimated amount required to provide the modest but adequate standard was \$1,800. Those nonmarried men and women having income of less than \$2,000 and those with less than \$1,500 as measured by the concepts—actual money income and income with prorated assets excluding the owned home—are shown in percentage terms in the following tabulation:

Income	Nonmarried men		Nonmarried women	
	Income less than—		Income less than—	
	\$2,000	\$1,500	\$2,000	\$1,500
Actual income.....	69	57	83	70
Income with prorated assets (excluding equity in owned home).....	60	48	79	66

The percentages of the survey units with income (actual and potential, including and excluding the owned home) of less than \$3,000 and less than \$2,000 for couples and, for nonmarried men and women, of less than \$2,000 and less than \$1,000 are shown in chart 1. These levels cover, in general, the critical ranges of concern in much of the current discussion of the identification of the "poor."

(Chart omitted from printing.)

The role of assets may also be judged by examining the proportion of those at each income level who shift into a higher level when the classification is by potential income. A cross-tabulation of the units by

actual income and by income with prorated assets excluding the owned home permits the measurement of such shifts. Those units with no assets, or with assets so small that their potential income falls in the same \$1,000 intervals as their actual income, are classified as having "no improvement." The few units whose potential income falls in a lower interval than their actual income are also classified in this way. The units who shift into the next higher income class with the addition of prorated assets are grouped as having "moderate improvement," and those who shift two or more classes as having "appreciable improvement."

The results, as shown in table 2 and chart 2, reflect the fact that most of the units with low incomes have little in the way of assets, especially when equity in the home is excluded. Most of the units—more than four-fifths of the nonmarried men and women and three-fourths of the couples—with actual incomes of less than \$3,000 remain in the same income interval when classified by potential income. The proportion remaining in the same class is greater at the income levels below \$3,000 than in the \$3,000 to \$5,000 classes. Conversely, the proportion with "appreciable" improvement increased with income, particularly among the nonmarried. Four percent of the couples with actual income of less than \$2,000 showed an appreciable improvement when classified by potential income; of those with actual income of \$3,000 to \$3,999, the improvement was substantial for 9 percent. For nonmarried men, on the other hand, 6 percent of those with actual income of less than \$2,000 but 27 percent of those with \$3,000 to \$3,999 showed an appreciable improvement. The pattern for nonmarried women was similar to that for the men.

TABLE 2.—Shifts in income level with addition to actual income of prorated assets (excluding equity in nonfarm home) ¹ for units aged 65 and over—Percentage distribution at specified income level, by extent of improvement, 1962

Actual income level and marital status	Number reporting ² (thousands)	Total percent	Percent with—		
			No improvement ³	Moderate improvement ⁴	Appreciable improvement ⁵
Married couples:					
Less than \$1,000.....	224	100	76	19	4
\$1,000 to \$1,999.....	1,007	100	81	14	4
\$2,000 to \$2,999.....	1,097	100	77	16	6
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	713	100	76	15	9
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....	453	100	68	(⁶)	(⁶)
Nonmarried men:					
Less than \$1,000.....	677	100	86	9	6
\$1,000 to \$1,999.....	767	100	80	14	6
\$2,000 to \$2,999.....	339	100	72	11	17
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	101	100	57	16	27
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....	67	100	52	(⁶)	(⁶)
Nonmarried women:					
Less than \$1,000.....	2,572	100	87	11	2
\$1,000 to \$1,999.....	1,698	100	85	9	6
\$2,000 to \$2,999.....	487	100	75	11	13
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	141	100	55	18	26
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....	61	100	11	(⁶)	(⁶)

¹ Actual income less income from assets plus the portion of asset holdings that would have been available for spending annually if all assets were prorated over the average remaining years of life of the unit, with a 4-percent annual return. Sex differentials in longevity included in computation. For couples, proration based on joint probability of the number of years remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw ½ of asset holdings available to couple annually.

² Based on information for survey units reporting both amount of money income in 1962 and amount of assets at the end of 1962; distribution among income classes therefore not strictly comparable with that shown for actual income in table 1.

³ Income with prorated assets in same class or class below actual income.

⁴ Income with prorated assets one class above actual income.

⁵ Income with prorated assets two or more classes above actual income.

⁶ Distribution between "moderate improvement" and "appreciable improvement" not available.

BENEFICIARY STATUS

The next question to be explored concerns the pattern of change found for OASDI beneficiaries⁶ and for nonbeneficiaries. Do the results found for all those aged 65 and over hold for both these groups when their actual income is compared with their potential income?

Differences between actual income and potential income for beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries are fairly similar as shown by the following medians; the differences tend to be a few percentage points greater for the beneficiaries.

Type of unit	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	
		Excluding home equity	Including home equity
Married couples:			
Beneficiaries.....	\$2,800	\$3,020	\$3,685
Nonbeneficiaries.....	3,580	3,835	4,585
Nonmarried men:			
Beneficiaries.....	1,405	1,640	1,960
Nonbeneficiaries.....	1,145	1,325	1,560
Nonmarried women:			
Beneficiaries.....	1,225	1,330	1,630
Nonbeneficiaries.....	755	815	960

Changes in beneficiary-nonbeneficiary relationships when measured by potential rather than actual income are the net result of an intricate pattern of differences in the level of assets, their distribution by income class, and the average ages of the individuals in the beneficiary-nonbeneficiary groups being compared. Thus, the beneficiary couples had less in assets than the nonbeneficiaries, but they were somewhat older; the nonmarried men and women beneficiaries had somewhat greater assets than the nonbeneficiaries, but they were somewhat younger. Asset holdings increased rather more steeply with income for nonmarried beneficiary men than for the other groups.

Comparison of the actual and potential income of beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries has also been made on the basis of the percentage of the units with income less than a specified amount. The proportion of couples aged 65 and over with less than \$2,500 is shown below.

Income less than \$2,500	Beneficiaries	Nonbeneficiaries
Actual income.....	42	38
Income with prorated assets (excluding equity in owned home).....	37	35

⁶ Income data previously presented (in the March Bulletin) for beneficiaries related to those who had been on the rolls for a full year, because income in the year of retirement is not meaningful in comparing the income of beneficiaries with those of nonbeneficiaries. Assets, however, were presented (in the November Bulletin) for all beneficiaries, which in effect showed them in a more favorable asset position than if only full-year beneficiaries had been shown. Data for all beneficiaries have also been used here since the major purpose has been to focus on the comparisons of actual and potential income for the important groups of the aged.

These data suggest greater improvement in position for the beneficiaries than for the nonbeneficiaries. Similar relationships hold for nonmarried men and women at two income levels—less than \$2,000 and less than \$1,500—as shown by the following percentages:

Income	Nonmarried men		Nonmarried women	
	Bene- ficiaries	Non- benefi- ciaries	Bene- ficiaries	Non- benefi- ciaries
Less than \$2,000:				
Actual income.....	69	69	80	86
Income with pro- rated assets (ex- cluding equity in owned home).....	59	64	75	84
Less than \$1,500:				
Actual income.....	55	59	64	79
Income with pro- rated assets (ex- cluding equity in owned home).....	46	54	58	76

Perhaps the most striking finding emerging from this analysis is that more than

half the nonmarried nonbeneficiary men and three-fourths of the nonbeneficiary women have potential income of less than \$1,500 (excluding home equity).

Table 3 gives, for beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries, data on the proportion of units at each actual income level that shift with the addition of prorated assets. These data support the findings for all units aged 65 and over grouped by marital status. In general, the proportion with moderate or appreciable improvement increases as income increases, and conversely the proportion whose potential income is at the same level as their actual income or at a lower one declines as income increases.

AGE

There is a tendency for asset holdings to decrease with age, especially if no member of the unit is working. On the other hand, of course, the life expectancy decreases, and the prorated amount to be added to actual income increases with age. Data shown in table 4 suggest that, when the groups aged 65 to 72 and aged 73 and over are compared, the decrease in life expectancy is the stronger influence. Differences between actual and potential income are generally

greater for the group aged 73 and over than for the younger group.

The decrease in income with age is thus less striking when potential income rather than actual income is compared. The median actual income of married couples aged 73 and over was, for example, 30 percent less than that of those aged 65 to 72; the median income with prorated assets was 24 percent lower when home equity was excluded. Only for the relatively small group of nonbeneficiary nonmarried men is the percentage difference between potential and actual income less for the older than for the younger group. The level of asset holdings of the older men was very much lower—so low that the age advantage was not sufficient to overcome the difference. Although there is some tendency for the ratio of potential to actual income to be higher for the group aged 65 to 72 than for those aged 62 to 64, this tendency was neither very striking nor consistent for the various marital-beneficiary comparisons. The difference according to age is not so great as in the previous comparison, and assets may be greater or less, depending in large part upon the employment and earnings situation.

TABLE 3.—Shifts in income level with addition to actual income of prorated assets (excluding equity in nonfarm home),¹ by OASDI beneficiary status, for units aged 65 and over—Percentage distribution at specified income level, by extent of improvement, (1962)

Actual income level and marital status	OASDI beneficiaries					Nonbeneficiaries				
	Number reporting ² (in thousands)	Total percent	Percent with—			Number reporting ² (in thousands)	Total percent	Percent with—		
			No improvement ³	Moderate improvement ⁴	Appreciable improvement ⁵			No improvement ³	Moderate improvement ⁴	Appreciable improvement ⁵
Married couples:										
Less than \$1,000.....	138	100	80	17	3	87	100	70	23	7
\$1,000 to \$1,999.....	816	100	79	17	4	193	100	88	5	7
\$2,000 to \$2,999.....	1,001	100	78	16	6	96	100	74	16	10
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	606	100	76	14	10	109	100	75	19	6
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....	367	100	68	(⁶)	(⁶)	85	100	67	(⁶)	(⁶)
Nonmarried men:										
Less than \$1,000.....	367	100	81	12	7	311	100	92	4	4
\$1,000 to \$1,999.....	623	100	80	15	5	147	100	78	14	8
\$2,000 to \$2,999.....	278	100	75	10	15	61	100	87	13	30
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	72	100	49	19	32	29	(⁷)	(⁷)	(⁷)	(⁷)
Nonmarried women:										
Less than \$1,000.....	1,213	100	83	15	2	1,359	100	92	6	2
\$1,000 to \$1,999.....	1,272	100	85	10	5	427	100	85	5	10
\$2,000 to \$2,999.....	354	100	79	12	10	134	100	66	10	24
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	93	100	62	14	24	48	(⁷)	(⁷)	(⁷)	(⁷)

¹ Total money income, less income from assets plus the portion of asset holdings that would have been available for spending annually if all assets were prorated over the average remaining years of life of the unit, with a 4-percent annual return. Sex differentials in longevity included in computation. For couples, proration based on joint probability of the number of years remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw 3/4 of asset holdings available to couple annually.

² Based on information for survey units reporting both amount of money income in

1962 and amount of assets at end of 1962. Distribution among income classes therefore not strictly comparable with that shown for actual income in table 1.

³ Income with prorated assets in same class or class below actual income.

⁴ Income with prorated assets 1 class above actual income.

⁵ Income with prorated assets 2 or more classes above actual income.

⁶ Distribution between "moderate improvement" and "appreciable improvement" not available.

⁷ Percentage not computed when number is less than 50,000.

EARNINGS

Earlier reports from the 1963 survey of the aged have shown earnings to be one of the important components of income, even for the population group aged 65 and over. Incomes are appreciably lower for those who have retired or are unemployed than for those who still have income from their work. Resources other than income are of particular importance to this low-income group, and evidence from the survey has been used to determine the extent to which the proration of assets, excluding the home, affects their relative financial position.

The data shown in table 5 indicate that differences in median income between earners and nonearners are greater for potential than for actual income. Those with no in-

come from earnings have lower assets, and even though they are an older group their median position is not improved by more than about 10 percent, in general, by the proration of assets. The differences between the median income of those with and those without earnings are especially great for the nonbeneficiaries in both dollar and percentage terms, whether measured by actual or potential income.

A more significant comparison may be that of the earners who are not beneficiaries with nonearners who are beneficiaries. The data in table 5 suggest, at least for the group of persons presently approaching retirement, that the assets they own cannot be expected to cushion the drop in income that inevitably accompanies withdrawal from the labor

force. If the nonbeneficiary earners represent the preretirement group and the beneficiaries without earnings the retired, the median income of the former (with a deduction of, say, 5 percent for savings) may be compared with the potential income of the latter as estimates of consumption levels. (The use of potential income assumes dissavings of the amount of prorated assets.) For couples, these estimates are \$4,745 as the preretirement level and \$2,550 as the post-retirement level. The comparable estimates for nonmarried men are \$3,755 and \$1,580. An allowance for taxes would narrow the gap; nevertheless, assets would not appear sufficient to prevent a considerable reduction in the level of living following retirement.

TABLE 4.—Income, actual ¹ and with prorated assets (excluding and including equity in nonfarm homes),² for units aged 62 and over—Medians, by age, 1962

Age	Married couples			Nonmarried men			Nonmarried women		
	Total	OASDI beneficiaries	Non-beneficiaries	Total	OASDI beneficiaries	Non-beneficiaries	Total	OASDI beneficiaries	Non-beneficiaries
Median: ³									
Actual income:									
62 to 64.....	\$5,200	\$2,950	\$5,900	\$1,775	\$1,375	\$2,685	\$1,610	\$1,395	\$2,205
65 to 72.....	3,340	3,050	4,750	1,765	1,720	1,980	1,280	1,400	855
73 and over.....	2,325	2,425	1,680	1,165	1,260	860	885	1,035	720
Income with prorated assets, excluding equity in owned home:									
62 to 64.....	5,395	2,920	6,155	1,900	1,410	2,925	1,645	1,385	2,330
65 to 72.....	3,480	3,260	4,890	1,925	1,855	2,250	1,335	1,475	890
73 and over.....	2,640	2,745	1,850	1,335	1,450	920	975	1,200	795
Income with prorated assets, including equity in owned home:									
62 to 64.....	5,930	3,310	6,705	2,000	1,510	2,940	2,080	1,755	2,805
65 to 72.....	4,105	3,865	5,785	2,120	2,035	2,420	1,575	1,750	1,055
73 and over.....	3,300	3,380	2,355	1,550	1,855	980	1,250	1,485	930

¹ Total money income in 1962.² Actual income less income from assets plus the portion of asset holdings that would have been available for spending annually if all assets were prorated over the average remaining years of life of the unit, with a 4-percent annual return. Sex differentials in longevity included in computation. For couples, proration based on joint probability of the number of years remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw $\frac{2}{3}$ of asset holdings available to couple annually.³ For actual income, based on information for those survey units reporting amount of money income received in 1962. For income with prorated assets, based on information for those survey units reporting both amount of money income in 1962 and amount of their assets at the end of 1962. Median actual income of those reporting on both money income and asset holdings would probably vary slightly from the amount estimated from the larger base, particularly for units aged 62 to 64.

SUMMARY

The economic status of the aged has been described through a constructive, potential income. This measure combines information on the money income, the asset holdings, and the age and sex of each unit. The addition of prorated assets to money income provides a summary figure for grouping units who are equally well off in terms of their combined income and asset position and then studying the distributions of the units by this new measure in comparison with their distributions by money income.

Median incomes were increased 10 percent when prorated assets excluded the owned home and more than 30 percent when equity in the owned home was included. The increases in the medians were appreciably greater for those aged 73 and over than for those aged 62 to 64 or 65 to 72, because of the shorter remaining lifespan over which assets were prorated.

The differences in the medians tended to be a few percentage points higher for beneficiaries than for nonbeneficiaries, and they were higher both in dollar amounts and

relatively for those units including an earner than for those with no earned income.

More than three-fourths of those with income of less than \$3,000 did not have asset holdings great enough to place their potential income in a higher \$1,000 interval than that in which their actual income fell.

The findings reflect, and are simply another way of pointing out, the established fact that asset holdings are larger at the higher income levels than at the lower. The inequalities in the distributions of income are greater for potential than for actual income.

TABLE 5.—Size of income, actual ¹ and with prorated assets (excluding equity in nonfarm home),² for units aged 65 and over with and without earnings—Percentage distribution, by income interval, 1962

Total income	Married couples				Nonmarried men				Nonmarried women			
	Without earnings		With earnings		Without earnings		With earnings		Without earnings		With earnings	
	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	Actual income	Income with prorated assets
Number (in thousands):												
Total.....	2,449	2,449	2,998	2,998	1,738	1,738	666	666	4,907	4,907	1,422	1,422
Reporting on income ³	2,030	2,030	2,309	2,309	1,530	1,530	536	536	4,025	4,025	1,061	1,061
Total percent.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Less than \$1,000.....	8	6	3	2	39	35	14	7	59	52	20	13
\$1,000 to \$1,999.....	33	30	14	12	40	35	29	26	32	34	37	34
\$2,000 to \$2,999.....	31	29	21	17	15	18	19	18	5	6	26	25
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	14	16	18	19	3	4	11	11	2	3	7	10
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....	7	9	14	12	1	3	10	12	1	1	3	6
\$5,000 and over.....	7	10	31	38	2	5	17	27	2	4	6	11
Median ⁴												
All units.....	\$2,285	\$2,475	\$3,680	\$3,985	\$1,265	\$1,430	\$2,380	\$2,935	\$855	\$955	\$1,810	\$2,095
OASDI beneficiaries.....	2,365	2,550	3,420	3,740	1,410	1,580	2,130	2,570	1,040	1,205	1,840	2,105
Nonbeneficiaries.....	1,775	1,875	4,995	5,550	845	890	3,950	4,320	695	745	1,680	2,060

¹ Total money income in 1962.² Actual income less income from assets plus the portion of asset holdings that would have been available for spending annually if all assets were prorated over the average remaining years of life of the unit, with a 4-percent annual return. Sex differentials in longevity included in computation. For couples, proration based on joint probability of the number of years remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw $\frac{2}{3}$ of asset holdings available to couple annually.³ Data based on information for survey units reporting both amount of money income received in 1962 and amount of assets held at end of 1962. Data on actual income therefore not strictly comparable with those shown in table 1.⁴ Medians based on \$1,000 income groupings and therefore not strictly comparable with those shown in table 1, based on \$500 groupings.

SOCIAL SECURITY SHOULD COVER MENTAL ILLNESS AND TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an unfortunate remnant of the days when illness was viewed as an invasion of the human body by evil spirits remains in our public assistance laws. This is the provision in the Social Security Act

which calls for different treatment under the law for those suffering from tuberculosis and mental illness than is given those afflicted by other ills. I have today again introduced legislation which would help bring this aspect of our public assistance programs up to date and provide for equality of treatment for all of those who are ill and eligible for public welfare aid.

I was very disappointed, in this connection, with President Kennedy's message of February 5, 1963, on mental illness and retardation. The problem which I have noted was ignored and nothing was mentioned to achieve the goals toward which my proposal is guided. The final bill which became law also ignored this problem. The bill I again propose would be a constructive step forward in helping the mentally ill and those with tuberculosis.

As our understanding of disease has progressed, we have gone further toward realizing certain basic similarities in illness. The specific exception of tuberculosis and mental illness from the general provisions of our Social Security Act is a reflection of bygone days.

During the last session, a provision such as the one here was in the Social Security Amendments of 1964—the bill which died in conference. It is my hope that that bill will be enacted in the near future.

OPTIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would make it possible for Americans to choose, in planning their retirement future, whether they shall be covered by social security or a qualified private benefit plan. This bill is offered in no sense to undermine social security, but rather to improve the opportunities for our people to get the best plan for their money in preparing for their retirement.

At present, the social security system is a young one. Maturity for it will not be reached until we have had three generations of workers covered during their entire productive lives by social security and until it has had the opportunity of meeting all of the challenges of our economic cycles. The amendment which I have offered will help social security meet these challenges and grow into a sound program upon which the retirement future of our people can be based.

Several years ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 3, pages 3292-3294, a speech which I made, "Politics Can Destroy Social Security," in which I outlined the threats to our social security system from a failure to recognize its inherent characteristics and limitations. This bill is designed to prevent the system's very possible destruction by

preserving its integrity for those who are counting upon it and by creating a better awareness of its true nature. Quite often social security is spoken of as insurance—indeed, the most important part of the system is entitled old age, survivors, and disability insurance—but it is not insurance in the common or legal meaning of the word. It is a share-the-wealth plan. My purpose today is not to discuss the concept of sharing the wealth, that debate can wait another day. What I hope to accomplish through the introduction of this bill and discussion of it is a better understanding of social security so that it may achieve the purposes for which it was designed and meet the needs which exist for it in our society.

As to the details of the bill itself, social security would remain mandatory for those who had not entered a qualified private benefit program. Thus we would not permit one to ignore his future, but we would permit each individual to weigh which path toward retirement security is best for him in the range of qualified plans.

I believe serious consideration of this proposal would be profitable both in saving our social security system and in permitting a sound basis for the retirement life of all of our citizens.

PANEL DISCUSSION ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, the Commonwealth Club of California had a panel discussion by ABC worldwide commentators in regard to the international situation in the Far East. The comments of these worldwide observers are most interesting and furnish us a background of on-the-spot observation. The published flashes in the Commonwealth of this meeting follow:

MUST RED CHINA BE STOPPED IN VIETNAM? ARNOT-SCALI CLASH HIGHLIGHTS ABC EIGHT-COMMENTATOR PANEL

Charles P. Arnot (southeast Asia): "Not long ago I commented that the real question was not whether—but when—we would have to go to war with Red China. I withdraw that statement. On reflection, it was not strong enough."

"I feel that we are already at war with Red Chinese imperialism, with Communist North Vietnam, and with their agents in South Vietnam, the Vietcongs."

"South Vietnam is Red China's 'Spain.' It is high time we faced up to this fact."

"Not long ago, I was present when our pilot, in a scramble, went into the air with orders to shoot down Red Chinese planes if they went below a certain place on the map. For 23,000 uniformed Americans, we are at war. Certainly it was war for the 250 Americans killed (as even Washington admits) by enemy action."

"ASHAMED AT QUESTION: SHOULD WE WITHDRAW?"

"For the past 18 months, I have been in south Asia. Returning to this country, I'm ashamed and amazed to hear the question: Should we withdraw? Should we negotiate?"

"We did go into South Vietnam. We said it was the place where we would stop the march of the Communists across southeast Asia."

"Before there is any more defeatism and talk about 'escalation,' we should ask, are we prepared to allow all Asia to go to Red China? Are we prepared to be the paper tiger Red China says we are? Are we prepared to allow Latin America and Africa to go to the Communists as well?"

"Is our word any more sacred in West Berlin than it is in South Vietnam? If it is, as I hope, we have to get tough in South Vietnam. Red China is today posing the greatest threat to world peace and she must be stopped in South Vietnam."

Johns Scall (Washington, D.C.):

"With all due respect to my colleague, his view is a prescription for bloody disaster in the Far East."

"The vital security interests of the United States and the free world do not stand on who possesses this particular real estate half the world away."

"Total victory in Vietnam, while desirable, is not worth the price. We can win, but only after a Korea-type war, with a quarter million American casualties. And after the war, we will have solved virtually nothing. There will be the same frustrating problems, the same quarrelsome politicians, the same ambitious generals, the same discontented Buddhists. Intervention in such a situation would be the height of folly."

"SHOULD NOT MAKE EMOTIONAL DECISION"

"While defeat in South Vietnam would make the situation in southeast Asia more difficult, it would not open all Asia to Communist domination. We should not make an emotional decision to intervene simply because we can't save people who don't want to be saved."

"A tolerable compromise is still possible. A master persuader, Lyndon Johnson, is about to test his ability in this regard."

Russ Jones (Berlin):

"In his inaugural remarks, the President had two things to say about satellite Europe and I agree with one, disagree with the other."

"He said the Communist empire is crumbling. I do not agree. It may be loosening up, but militarily the Warsaw Pact (Communist counterpart to NATO) is as solid as ever. There is no likelihood that Eastern Europe will spin away from the Kremlin militarily."

"BERLIN PUT ON ICE"

"President Johnson also advocated increased trade with these countries. I agree."

"We are even now doing this with the rubber plant in Rumania and Conrad Hilton's talks with the Hungarians about possibility of a hotel in Budapest—it's already being called the 'Comrade Hilton.'"

"Berlin a year ago was a very hot spot but it has been put on ice as a result of the colloquy between Washington and Moscow. Both sides have agreed to leave Berlin alone. This is good for America. I hope and believe that Berlin will remain on ice for the next year or more."

WILL IT BE GREAT BRITAIN, OR LITTLE ENGLAND?—SHEEHAN; LAZARD CONGO REPORT; CIOFFI DESTROYS DE GAULLE MYTHS

Bill Sheehan (London):

"Britain is faced with two basic questions: Will she be forced to devalue the pound? Can she modernize her industry? She is plagued by restrictive labor practices, the

failure of business and industry to modernize, and resulting low productivity. She buys more than she sells abroad. If tough emergency measures don't work, devaluation will be the only alternative.

"GREAT BRITAIN, OR LITTLE ENGLAND?"

"The question is, what kind of a country is Britain going to be—the Britain of the great tradition, an influence in the world—Great Britain, or little England?"

"British history might be different had not General de Gaulle rejuvenated France at the expense of his allies."

Lou Cioffi (Paris):

"Few people really understand De Gaulle, and he doesn't make it easy: he even talks in archaic French."

"When I first went on this assignment I thought my French was pretty good. But after hearing De Gaulle I asked a French colleague to tell me what he had said in English. My colleague replied, 'Tell me what he said in French.'"

"It is a myth that De Gaulle is a dictator. Nothing can be further from the truth. He has been freely elected. All his policies have been approved by the French people. If he ran again, he would surely be reelected."

"NOT ANTI-AMERICAN"

"It is a myth that he is anti-American. His presence at the Kennedy funeral was, really, a tribute to the American people. In the Cuba incident he was the first of our allies to stand with us."

"It is a myth that you never know what he is going to do. If you read his speeches, even back to 1945, you'll find they say exactly what he is doing now."

"It is a myth that he wants to destroy the Atlantic Alliance. He knows he is dependent on U.S. power. But he is a realist who wants to get rid of the NATO state. What is really important is that his aims are the same as ours."

"Finally, it is a myth that he is not fond of reporters. It is not true. He dislikes us intensely."

Sidney Lazard (Rome):

"You can't imagine the horror of the Congo. I couldn't until I got there and saw the victims."

"A refugee Catholic priest broke down and cried as he told how his altar boys—representing the leading families in Stanleyville—cheered as the rebels committed atrocity after atrocity. Civilization there is that thin."

"There is a very serious cold war overlay, involving the United States, Red China, and the Soviet Union. United States position is difficult: We back Tshombe, probably Africa's most unpopular man. Our stock with other African nations has suffered greatly, but if we drop him, the pro-Western Congolese Government will fall and pro-Communist element take over; that country, with its mineral riches and strategic location, will be lost."

"NEUTRALIST BODY?"

"The only alternative to an increase in the cold war (and I foresee that increase this year, with a far greater American involvement) would be to have the cold warriors replaced by the U.N. or the Organization of African Unity, or perhaps some neutralist body acceptable to African leaders."

"In the last 4 years we have learned the Congolese are incapable of governing themselves. Until the cold warriors are replaced, they'll stay there—and the greater will be chance of escalation to an African Vietnam."

NEW RUSS LEADERS WILL STAY IN 1965, SAYS JAFFE; ABC PANEL ANSWERS WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR AT LUNCHEON

Sam Jaffe (Moscow):

"President Johnson's remarks on steps to improve Soviet relations I'm sure will please

the new Kremlin leaders. Today Russia wants better relations with the United States."

"I'm sure Brezhnev and Kosygin will accept the President's invitation to appear on TV and to visit the United States, but not soon. They have agricultural and economic messes to clean up that Khrushchev left behind, and that's why he was ousted."

"The Sino-Soviet split has forced the Soviet Union closer to us. The Soviet Union is still an enemy, but friendlier."

"NO CHANGES SOON"

"Don't look for changes in leadership soon. Brezhnev and Kosygin are not power-mad men who blasted their way in, but solid organization men who rely on their advisers. We'll see no shoe-pounding, no off-the-cuff statements in the near future."

"I was impressed by Kosygin, he'll be the front man. Both of these men are a new breed of Communists, born without a first-hand knowledge of Lenin or the fire of the Russian revolution."

"Not only will the new leaders stay in 1965, but we may see the day—and this is being considered—when the Presidium elects a Premier and a head of the Communist Party for a specified term."

Answers in written questions from floor

Question. Why not U.N. in Vietnam instead of solely U.S. action?

Answer (Scall): A favorite theme of Senator Morse; 10 Senators now agree. It has been opposed because outlook would be time-consuming debate while Communists still gained.

Answer (Arnot): Red China not a member of U.N. nor is North Vietnam. I saw U.N. operation in the Congo; idea is unrealistic. I don't think U.N. could do anything in Vietnam—it couldn't even solve border dispute between Cambodia and South Vietnam.

Question (W. George L. Hughes). Assuming English pound is devalued, effect on U.S. dollar? Gold price?

Answer (Sheehan). If pound is devalued, British living standard will drop. Dollar will be affected, therefore price of gold.

Question. Will France retain stability if De Gaulle dies? Attitude re United States and Europe?

Answer (Cioffi). French rather enjoy political stability—I don't think they'll ever go back to old Fourth Republic and its political musical chairs. De Gaulle has prepared for his own replacement. Transition will be smooth.

Answer (Jones). Adenauer-De Gaulle romance is about over. Germany is veering toward us, and I think will stay that way.

Answer (Sheehan). After De Gaulle, Britain would again apply for EEC and, with five countries ready to sign an agreement, I think will get in, which will be good for Atlantic Community.

Answer (Cioffi). Facts are wrong. I was in Brussels when negotiations were broken off. Negotiations were getting nowhere. Britain wanted in on her own terms. De Gaulle said "No—either you're a member of Europe, or not." Britain had refused to join when Common Market was formed and later sponsored Outer Seven to scuttle Common Market. Britain can come in tomorrow by accepting what six other nations have accepted.

Question (Edgar M. Kahn). Do you foresee Communists taking Hong Kong and Singapore?

Answer (Arnot). More important right now is complete Communist takeover of Cambodia and Indonesia. I don't foresee attacks against Hong Kong but Red China through Sukarno has opened new front against us. Singapore is definitely in danger.

Question (Clyde Walthall): Will our Cuba policy be changed in 1965?

Answer (Jones). No—no more evidence that Johnson administration will compromise with Castro than that Kennedy would soften in later years.

Answer (Morgan). Cuba's policy is changing; she's suffered two major setbacks in Chile and Venezuela.

Answer (Scall). Castro continues to put out feelers toward the United States, based on idea that Castro can be Caribbean Tito. This is totally unacceptable—he has to go before relations can be normalized.

Question. Will Italian Communists gain power?

Answer (Lazard). Not likely in next 20 years. You read that Communists gained votes; fact is, Communist Party is losing strength; cells smaller; control of labor and university youth groups dwindling. Italian Communist Party is traditional party of protest—increased vote for Communists means Italy is unhappy, not that Communists will take over.

Question (Hilary H. Crawford). Why don't we stop trying to set up democratic government in Vietnam, but back strongest group and go all out to win?

Answer (Scall). We now have no illusion about desirability of supporting a stable government, democratic based or not. But there's no way of achieving that at present.

Answer (Arnot). Problem is twofold, (1) leadership and (2) convincing the people we're there to stay. We must use the only virile element, the military, and go in to win. We can only do it with deeds.

Question (Turkish Consul General Myron B. Goldsmith). Future of Cyprus?

Answer (Lazard). Trouble next March when U.N. peace force leaves.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as the greatest democratic republic in the world, the United States has a direct, vital interest in the cause of freedom and individual liberty everywhere in the world.

Today, we mark the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, which is the largest non-Russian nation in Europe subjugated to Communist tyranny. There are other occasions to come during the year when this House will pay formal tribute to the struggle for liberty in other captive nations. The catalog is long and grim. Our hearts go out to those held captive and our admiration for their unflinching spirit is unbounded.

So long as they remain captive and oppressed, our freedom here in America is threatened. But, so long as they keep the struggle for freedom alive, there is hope in ultimate victory.

It is well for us here to take this time to give official recognition to the continuing efforts of the people of the Ukraine to become masters of their own destiny once more. Their struggle is ours and of mutual concern to all who believe in the cause of individual liberty and freedom.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston Churchill's name is forever associated with the cause of freedom and its finest hours. A politician in the highest sense of the word, he set standards of courage, vision, and leadership on which public servants and all freedom-loving men of every nation may model themselves without reservation.

Born an aristocrat, Churchill touched the hearts and stirred the finest feelings in men of every walk of life. Throughout his long, extraordinary career, he did nothing cheap or mean and no breath of scandal touched him.

He was also born half-American and died in the enjoyment of full citizenship bestowed on him by Congress in the name of a grateful people allied with him in the common cause of freedom.

Every American laments his passing.

Free men everywhere will long walk in the titanic shadow of this great and good man.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of reflection in the heart of every man who loves freedom. It is a day of remembrance, but it is a day of sad remembrance, because it was on this day, just 47 years ago, on January 22, 1918, that one of the great nations of Europe, after centuries of slavery, achieved its freedom. It was on that day that the Ukraine became, once more, an independent nation.

Now that freedom is once more dead.

These are a great people. For centuries they had been a great nation, a great religious nation, a nation whose agriculture and culture were the solid heartland of Eastern Europe. But they became pawns in the tide of European power politics.

They tried in vain to placate the czars of the 17th century. In the treaty of Pereyaslav, on January 18, 1654, they hoped that their freedom would be protected while giving the czar certain military rights. Their hopes were in vain. The czar used the treaty to interfere in the internal affairs of Ukraine, and in 1667 Ukraine was divided between Poland and Russia.

But if freedom was taken away, the hearts of the people still lived. They re-

volted in 1708. But the revolt failed, and the punishment wrought upon Ukraine was terrible. Czar Peter I massacred thousands upon thousands of Ukrainians. We all remember Hitler's vengeance upon the city of Lidice in World War II. How few of us remember that Czar Peter tortured and massacred the entire city of Baturyn as punishment for that revolt in 1708.

But even then the hope of freedom did not die. Even the songs of freedom did not die. The great Ukrainian Poet Taras Shevchenko raised his voice for this freedom, and paid for his bravery by years of servitude. Year after countless year the people dreamed of freedom, and in the tumult at the close of the First World War they finally achieved it.

It was a short lived independence. The Soviet Union recognized that independence, but immediately began a program of subversion and conquest, and in 1920 the Ukraine was swallowed in the vastness of the Soviet Union, under the crushing heel of communism.

They have labored under that heel ever since. The Soviet Union, with cynical disregard for truth proclaims that Ukraine is free. It is not. But it dreams of freedom.

Perhaps our words here will have little effect. But if they have one effect, they will not be wasted. Let our words here in the Congress of the United States, the very fortress of freedom, cry across the thousands of the children of the Ukraine in the United States to the Ukrainians in the mother country that their freedom has not been forgotten, and that we, too, await the day when they will speak their own tongue when they worship their own God under their own free flag.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, history tells us that the people of the Ukraine announced their national independence as Russian troops advanced on Kiev, seat of the government. Within a month, the Kiev defense of 750 soldiers, including 250 high school boys, had been cruelly slaughtered by 6,000 Russian marines. And within a period of months, the independent Ukrainian Government had been destroyed, thousands of Ukrainian patriots shot.

However short the lifetime of a free Ukraine, we are reminded on this January 22, 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, of the invincibility of a noble idea and of the enuring power of freedom, even as a memory.

We are pleased to join with all Ukrainians and their descendants in our country in marking this anniversary. We take heart in the profound belief that the cause of liberty will not forever remain unserved.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we all mourn the passing of Sir Winston Churchill, probably the greatest man of this century.

He possessed so many great attributes and so many attributes of greatness that we hardly know which are the most important to remember.

He had indomitable courage and perseverance, proven both in his personal life and in his leadership of Great Britain and the free world.

He had a capacity for being absolutely honest, even when his candid assessments of things as they actually were were not appreciated and were not popular.

We should remember especially that he was always skeptical about Russian intentions. At Teheran, it was Churchill who tried in vain to safeguard the interests of the Western democracies, rightly guessing that after World War II we would find our peace and security endangered by international communism.

The Russians, even during his final illness, have castigated Churchill as the man who started the cold war. Of course, that is preposterous. It is one thing to start something; it is something else to be able to see clearly what is happening in the world.

Churchill early perceived the course of international communism and the treachery of the Russians. Had we in the United States heeded his advice sooner, many of communism's advances would never have been achieved.

The greatest need of the world today is for more men of the caliber of Winston Churchill.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the 22d of January 1965, marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukraine and the 46th anniversary of the union of all Ukrainian lands into one sovereign republic. On this occasion, I would like to have the privilege of asking our distinguished colleagues of the House of Representatives to pause for a moment to pay tribute to the undying struggle of Ukrainians for freedom.

For the past 250 years the Ukrainian history has been one of blood and tears. This nation with 1,000-year-old history and culture of its own has fought a

losing battle for freedom. After struggles for centuries against repeated invaders, chiefly against Russian autocracy, the Ukrainians overthrew their oppressors in 1918. Hard-fought freedom finally came to them when, on January 22 that year, the Rada, the popularly elected Ukrainian Parliament, proclaimed the independence of Ukrainian National Republic and promised to be the foundation of a democratic government. On January 22, 1919, it also proclaimed the act of union, whereby all the Ukrainian territories united into one sovereign and independent state.

But in the very next year, November 1920, even before the joy and jubilation had ceased, Bolshevik Russia conquered and made the young republic one of its satellites, ending her newly won independence all too soon. For half of this century, the stouthearted and freedom-loving Ukrainian people, through the forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union in 1933, have been ruled by brutal and ruthless suppression. And the Kremlin daily digs a trench of everlasting resentment wider and wider as this policy of subjugation continues.

The Ukrainians were the first victim of Communist imperio colonialism brought about against the absolute will of the people—a victim with every loss of the right to live, every restriction of freedom of thought, every damage done to the dignity of life, every opportunity lost for a share in the intelligent advance of the age in which we live.

A sage said that a man is free from the time of his very birth, and life and liberty are something inseparable. As long as he lives, he is endowed with the right to be free. This is the clear leading of God, the moving principle of the current age and through all eternity, the just claim of the whole human race. It is something that cannot be stamped out, or stifled or gagged, or suppressed.

Now, a great new age wakes before us, the old one of force being over. And the new age of righteousness and truth is here. All creation now stifled by the ice and snow, will soon be awakened by the breezes of early spring and life will spring forth from the dark earth to the light of freedom.

On this solemn and memorable occasion, we the people of the United States and all the peace-loving friendly nations enjoying our God-given freedom and dignity of life, wholeheartedly join the 45 million Ukrainians and other enslaved peoples the world over in the firm determination that their cherished desire of restoring sovereign independence, individual liberty, and dignity of man will soon return again.

THE UNITED STATES SHALL REIMBURSE THE STATES AND THEIR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS FOR REAL PROPERTY TAXES NOT COLLECTED ON REAL ESTATE PROPERTY OWNED BY A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT AND THEREFORE EXEMPT FROM TAXATION

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the

gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for real property taxes not collected on real property owned by a foreign government and therefore exempt from taxation.

This measure was first introduced by my distinguished colleague from the 12th Congressional District of New York, the Honorable EDNA F. KELLY, and I am pleased to lend my support to what I believe is a most necessary piece of legislation.

Communities in Westchester County, N.Y., have been particularly plagued by tax exemptions on properties owned by foreign governments. Because of their proximity to United Nations headquarters in New York City, where virtually every country has a major consulate, Westchester's cities, towns, and villages have been losing thousands of dollars every year because they cannot collect taxes on land and houses owned by foreign governments.

Mr. Speaker, in some communities, a number of ambassadors live tax free, thus making the taxes of other residents unbearably high. The U.S. attorney's office has held that communities must recover such lost tax revenues either through diplomatic channels or by having the taxes remain as a lien on the properties, to be recovered when and if the foreign governments sell them.

At a time when our local governments are hard pressed for revenues to such vital services as education, police and fire protection, and the like, the Federal Government should not add to the burden by permitting tax exemptions on properties not directly benefiting the communities in which they lie.

This situation was dramatized not too long ago in a law suit brought by the city of New Rochelle. An account appeared in the New York Times of December 17, 1964, and I introduce it for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 17, 1964]
NEW ROCHELLE SUIT ON ENVOYS' HOMES IS KILLED BY JUDGE

WHITE PLAINS, December 16.—A Westchester County judge dismissed most reluctantly today a suit by New Rochelle to foreclose tax liens of \$24,000 each for 1958 and 1959 on the residences of the Ambassadors of Ghana, Indonesia, and Liberia.

In his opinion, Judge Robert J. Trainor sharply criticized the widespread tax exemptions provided by State law for residences of foreign diplomats representing their countries in the United Nations.

The case decided today involved homes on Croft Terrace in New Rochelle.

"It might not be amiss," the judge wrote, "to wonder if the State Department realizes that our guests at the United Nations could virtually ruin some of our finest villages which are so conveniently located to the United Nations headquarters."

"If the ambassadors from 50 or more nations should decide to squat tax-free in the

highest assessables—and they take nothing but the best—in the same village, the taxes of the remainder of the inhabitants would be so high that they would not be able to afford the honor of having them."

The State Department had intervened to urge dismissal of the suit. Judge Trainor wrote that a court should not embarrass the Government in the conduct of its foreign affairs.

"The tongue of the U.S. attorney must have been jamming his cheek," he continued, "when he wrote * * * that New Rochelle must recover its taxes through diplomatic channels or, alternatively, these taxes could remain as a lien on the properties to be recovered when and if the foreign governments sell the properties."

CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I followed with considerable interest the remarks of some of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle during the debate over seating of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER]. While one aspect of this matter has now been settled by the vote on Tuesday of last week, I should like to make a number of comments prompted by this debate.

Mr. OTTINGER was criticized because, first, he spent about \$200,000 in his successful campaign in the 25th District of New York, and, second, because members of his family had contributed the great bulk of this money to a series of campaign committees established in his behalf. The questions are: Was it wrong for him to spend that much money, and was it wrong for him to receive that much money from his relatives? Unless we want to pretend that our Federal election laws really have any relevancy to today's election campaigns the answer must be "No" on both counts.

I think it is important to recall that there would have been no basis for criticism if the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] had not been forthright and honest in reporting his contributions and expenditures. He used no subterfuges. He concealed nothing. He filed a full report for all to see. In this connection I should like to recall the words of Senator Thomas Hennings, who during his years in the Senate fought long and hard for reform of our antiquated election laws. He said:

It is not money itself which is potentially a corruptive force in political campaigns, but money handled in secret.

A number of magazines and newspapers have come to Mr. OTTINGER's defense since he filed his campaign report and was criticized for it. One of them is the Reporter, which makes this excellent point:

Because he filed an honest report on his \$200,000 in campaign expenditures, the newly elected Congressman from New York's 25th

District is now being criticized by those persons who refuse to face the realities of financing a campaign for Congress.

The Reporter goes on to analyze the particular problem faced by a Democratic challenger in that congressional district located in a large urban area. And it observes that, in raising the large sums needed for this effort by tapping family funds, he avoided having to depend on special-interest groups which might compromise his stand on future issues.

The Louisville Courier-Journal, editorializing on the Ottinger controversy, said it was at a loss to understand the furor in view of the high costs of campaigning in this era of television and other costly mass media. The Courier-Journal concluded:

Perhaps the New York Times has a point in scolding the Congressman-elect for not disclosing the "nature and scope" of his financing during the race, but try as we could, we couldn't think of one congressional candidate who has followed such a course.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for the Congress to recognize that our Federal election laws are archaic. They are so unrealistic that they are ignored in all but the most superficial way. They set no limit on spending, in truth, because there are no requirements for reporting the receipts or expenditures of campaign committees working in the candidate's behalf. And if the limits found in the law could be enforced, they would be pitifully inadequate for today's campaign costs.

This is particularly true with respect to a challenger like the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER]. An incumbent has enormous advantages as we all know. He has the franking privilege with which to acquaint his constituents with his views throughout his term of office. He has a staff capable of rendering him invaluable assistance in the course of a campaign. He has telephone and telegraph allowances, typewriters, mimeograph machines, addressing machines, a stationery allowance, and many other appurtenances of office. The value of these many advantages cannot be expressed precisely in dollars, but it is considerable.

When a challenger sets out to campaign against an incumbent having all these advantages, he necessarily must spend more than the incumbent if he is going to achieve the same impact on the public. In Mr. OTTINGER's case this task was made more difficult because the registration in his district happens to be about 2 to 1 in favor of the other party.

If one were to ask a cross-section of voters how much money could reasonably be spent in such a campaign, I dare say that most would agree that an expenditure of \$1 per voter would not be unreasonable. With such a budget one might contemplate making two or three mailings to all voters, buying some billboards, and running some advertising on radio, on television, and in the press. However, within the dollar-per-voter limit one can see there would be some pretty hard decisions to be made as to what could be bought and what would have to be neglected.

Well, believe it or not, Mr. OTTINGER's budget was just such a budget. In fact, he spent less than \$1 for each registered voter, and he spent just a penny or two over \$1 for each vote cast. In his particular race, in an area where everyone reads the metropolitan newspapers which devote little free space to a contest like this, such a budget is not unreasonable. It is, to be sure, a lot of money for many of us to raise; it is a lot more money than I have ever spent in the Second District of Arizona; but it is not an unreasonable budget for this race under these circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I do not for a minute think that Members of Congress should be required to spend money like this, nor do I think that Congress should be restricted to people who have this kind of money. Rather, I believe we should recognize the need for legislation that will provide new sources of campaign funds, that will limit campaigns to reasonable lengths, that will provide perhaps more public-service time for debates and discussions on radio and television, and that will take into account the changes that have taken place in the art of campaigning in the last quarter century.

Until such new legislation is enacted I think we should at least acknowledge the reality that is about us and, rather than castigate candidates who make large investments in their own campaigns, thank them for showing this much interest in our Government and its political processes. This Nation is the better for the personal investment made in the many campaigns of John F. Kennedy; it can benefit, as well, from the willingness of DICK OTTINGER to invest some of his resources, and his family's resources, in the improvement of our Government. It is a rare Member who can take his seat without some obligation—express or implied—to those groups of individuals who supplied the money for a successful campaign.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I insert at this point in my remarks a number of magazine articles, editorials and letters which bear on Mr. OTTINGER's now celebrated campaign.

[From the Reporter magazine, Jan. 14, 1965.]

THE DISADVANTAGE OF BEING EARNEST

Because he filed an honest report on his \$200,000 in campaign expenditures, the newly elected Congressman from New York's 25th District is now being criticized by those persons who refuse to face the realities of financing a campaign for Congress.

RICHARD L. OTTINGER, son of the founder of the U.S. Plywood Corp., is a wealthy young man who worked for 3 years as a regional director in the Peace Corps and last March returned to his hometown of Pleasantville in Westchester County to run for the House of Representatives. He was an unknown Democrat in an overwhelmingly Republican district, and his opponent was a three-term incumbent Congressman. Most people in his area read the New York City newspapers, which had little free time or space to devote to 1 of the more than 70 congressional candidates within the New York metropolitan area. To get his name and views known, he had to spend lots of money.

Luckily for him, OTTINGER had family money he could use. He did not have to depend for financial support on special-interest groups who might compromise his stand on future issues. He even turned

down one large contribution of this kind. He did try to raise funds from small contributors—with some success. But the American public, dominated by the unsavory image of politicians in general, isn't willing to contribute in the amounts needed today.

OTTINGER's prime mistake, apparently, was to comply with antique Federal and State campaign-fund reporting and tax laws that in effect limit individual contributions to \$3,000 if the recipient is to avoid paying a gift tax—a totally unreasonable figure. To circumscribe this limitation, OTTINGER employed a well-established technique of setting up as many different committees as he needed \$3,000 contributions. In the recent presidential campaign, dozens of wealthy men contributed \$3,000 for themselves and individual members of their families to similarly constructed "paper" committees. Henry Ford II's \$3,000 checks to the Johnson campaign turned up in more than a half-dozen Democratic committees. Five members of the conservative Pew family of Pennsylvania contributed more than \$60,000 in tandem to the 1964 Republican presidential campaign, a contributing habit of the Rockefellers before the nomination of Senator Barry Goldwater. In ROBERT F. KENNEDY's recent Senate campaign, KENNEDY's brother-in-law Stephen Smith, family friend K. Lemoyne Billings, and others also exceeded the legal limit of \$5,000 by giving to more than one such committee. Most of the time in the House and Senate races, the embarrassment that has befallen OTTINGER is avoided by the simple technique of failing to file accurate and complete campaign fund reports. One of OTTINGER's New York colleagues in his 1962 race avoided the individual contribution limitation for a candidate—\$8,000—by reporting after the 1962 campaign that he had "loaned" his own campaign committee \$80,000. The law put him under no obligation to report when or even if his "loan" was repaid.

The New York Times and the Herald Tribune, who "exposed" OTTINGER's campaign funds after reading the public records, have since dropped the issue of political financing as quickly as they picked it up—but not before writing pious editorials about the need for reform. If the papers had directed a portion of their reforming zeal at getting OTTINGER's delinquent political contemporaries to own up to what they had actually spent, the young Westchesterite's \$200,000 might not stand out as much as it does—and some real progress at reform might be achieved. Without facing the real facts of ballooning campaign costs, reforms will not reach the basic problem—the need for new sources of funds—and therefore will be bypassed by Congress. The legislators are not about to make things actually worse, through legislation that cuts down on existing fund sources, just to satisfy reformers who want things to look better.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Jan. 6, 1965]

OTTINGER'S CASE IS NOT CAUSE FOR OUTRAGE

We are at a loss to understand the furor which has developed in New York over the campaign expenses of Democratic Representative-elect RICHARD L. OTTINGER, who apparently spent close to \$200,000 of his family's money getting elected last November.

In the first place, \$200,000 is hardly an astounding sum in this age of television campaigns. In the second place, OTTINGER appears to have broken no laws, unless it has suddenly become illegal to have a rich and indulgent family. If anything, his error seems to have come in being too scrupulous about reporting his campaign expenses.

One thing is certain: If OTTINGER is guilty of moral turpitude, he has lots of company. By setting up numerous campaign commit-

tees, and thus evading the legal limitation on campaign contributions, OTTINGER was merely following a time-worn practice which has helped to make Federal election laws a meaningless farce. The practice is not unique to New York. It is also prevalent in Kentucky.

THE LIMIT IS UNREALISTIC

Every member of the Kentucky congressional delegation questioned on the subject in 1962 had tried to avoid the necessity of reporting campaign contributions by having others handle the money. If it is really worked to perfection, the campaign committee gimmick can enable a Senator or House Member to both comply with the Corrupt Practices Act and conceal the amount, source, and date of all his campaign contributions.

Strict compliance with the act would have meant that OTTINGER could have spent no more than \$5,000 in his race, a stipulation precious few candidates live up to. This unrealistic limitation, plus the campaign committee loophole, force virtually every candidate to break the spirit, if not the letter, of the law.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER, Wisconsin Democrat, last year warned that unless Congress acts promptly to put teeth in Federal election laws, the rising cost of buying essential advertising in the mass media is "going to make the dollar-and-cents purchase of elections even more scandalous in the future than in the past." To this, we say amen.

Come to think of it, when it comes to buying an election, we could suggest far more ominous purchasers than the candidate's mother and sister, sole contributors to 22 of 34 Ottinger campaign committees. Perhaps the New York Times has a point in scolding the Congressman-elect for not disclosing the "nature and scope" of his financing during the race, but try as we could, we couldn't think of one congressional candidate who has followed such a course.

[From the Nation, Jan. 4, 1965]

MONEY AND POLITICS

Robert R. Barry, who represented the western part of Westchester County, adjoining New York City, and all of adjacent Putnam County, was on the Nation's list of Congressmen most eligible for retirement. However, the area is solidly Republican; Barry had served three terms and it looked as though he could stay in Washington as long as he chose. Since he is a comparatively young man, the prospect was gloomy. Thus, when RICHARD L. OTTINGER came out of the Peace Corps and defeated Barry, the Nation was both surprised and elated.

Without doubt OTTINGER will be a shining addition to a New York congressional delegation that can stand some luster, but his election raises a troublesome issue. Barry claims to have spent only \$25,000 on his campaign. OTTINGER's campaign cost some \$193,000, of which \$174,000 was contributed by his mother and sister through an assembly line of committees with names like "Citizens for Effective Government in Westchester," "Democratic Committee for Better Representation," "Ottinger for Congress Committee," etc. The New York Herald Tribune has listed 27 such committees; each received \$3,000 or \$6,000, depending on whether one or both relatives of the candidate contributed.

Joseph W. Shannon, writing in a Westchester newspaper, the Daily Times of Maroonneck, comments: "Money—and lots of it—is more and more the essential ingredient of political success. A poor man hardly has a chance these days." Shannon cites a "rumor" that Representative OGDEN R. REID, a Republican who successfully defended his seat in another part of Westchester, spent \$150,000. Mr. OTTINGER himself comments: "In this day and age, campaigning is very

expensive. A person who wants to run, particularly in a district held by the opposition, simply has to advertise—newspapers, billboards, radio—and this all costs money. A man has two choices. He can finance it himself, or he can go through organizations to which he is then beholden." He adds that the money was used not only on his behalf but to support other Democratic candidates in the district.

Mr. OTTINGER's case is certainly not unusual. Many of the more attractive public figures of our time are rich men—some self-made like Governor Romney, but most of them possessors of inherited wealth: Governor Scranton, Governor Rockefeller, Senator PELL, Senator CLARK, the KENNEDYS, and others. And when other State and National campaign costs are examined, OTTINGER's spending falls in perspective. ROBERT KENNEDY spent \$2 million to win his Senate seat from New York, a large portion of which came from his own fortune and from the fortunes of other Kennedys. The so-called President's Club of Lyndon B. Johnson is said to have secured 4,000 contributions of \$1,000 each. In the California senatorial primary, it cost Alan Cranston no less than \$800,000 to lose to Pierre Salinger.

There is no patent cure for this problem, but some proposals may have merit. Perhaps the Government should pick up the tab for certain kinds of campaign expenses, TV appearances in particular; perhaps the laws governing expenditures should be tightened, and it would be a good thing to broaden the base of political financing. Senator Goldwater demonstrated that large campaign funds can be raised in small amounts from thousands of donors through daily mail and television appeals. The fat cat is not indispensable. Certainly the problem should be kept under continuous study and investigation, for as the process of political inflation goes on, all sorts of talent, particularly young talent, is in effect barred from political office. Especially pertinent is the question of what happened to the report of the Commission on Campaign Expenditures, initiated by President Kennedy in 1962. Its specific proposals were mild enough: individual tax deductions for campaign contributions to a total of \$1,000 or, as an alternative, since only 40 percent of the taxpayers itemize deductions, a tax credit of one-half of campaign contributions to a total of \$10. Neither proposal was adopted, but a simple deduction of \$50 passed the Senate and was then voted down in the House. While President Johnson has espoused as his own most of the legislative programs and proposals of his predecessor, he has yet to say anything about campaign expenditures.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Record, Jan. 3, 1965]

THE SQUARE PEG

(By Peggy Williams)

The fuss over the dollars spent by OTTINGER's own family to set him up in the legislative business brought calls and letters from many readers. And we wonder if Frankenberg may not have stirred up a hornet's nest for which his GOP colleagues will not thank him. Personally, we wish our family had \$200,000 worth of confidence and interest in us. We think there is no complacency as sincere as financial backing by one's own family.

The comments by press confreres and some members of the voting public on the high cost of OTTINGER's run all ignored the very special factors involved: (1) the fact that the 25th Congressional District has been a traditionally GOP seat so long as we know of; (2) a GOP incumbent who had captured the run initially by primary held it; and (3) the majority of communications outlets in the 25th District in this kind of a situation costs money. But is it not fair to the

voter that he be reached? At any cost? And that he be informed on his alternatives? So at least his vote is his own and not the tool of a possible indoctrinated and interpretive press?

For the record—when OGDEN REID challenged Congressman Ed Dooley in the 26th District—in the primary (which he won)—REID spent, we are told, \$287,000 as against Dooley's \$21,000. If it's not OK to spend \$200,000 and up, let's go back and undo that one.

[Letter addressed to the New York Times]

The Editors,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: Your recent editorial on reported expenditures attributed to my election fails to appreciate the costs of modern-day campaigning. The real need for reform is to find a way to finance these high costs so that a challenger for high office need not be independently wealthy or indebted to special interest groups.

Candidates must and should make their records and positions known to the public. This is a substantial and expensive endeavor in a district of nearly 500,000 persons.

During the 8 months in which I campaigned, I was out meeting people 16 hours a day, 7 days a week. I met more than 100,000 people and talked to more than 400 groups. In order to do this, a candidate must have a staff to make appointments, write press releases, answer correspondence, do publicity, and work with the party organization on registration and getting out the vote.

The only way to be sure of getting into every house in the district is direct mail. I made three mailings to each of the 168,000 families in my district. Each mailing cost about \$20,000 or 12 cents per family. This includes 4 cents for postage, 3 cents for printing, one-half cent for the envelope, one-half cent for the letterhead, 2 cents for addressing, and 2 cents for folding, stuffing, collating, handling, and trucking. Thus, the cost of my mailings was \$60,000, about one-third the cost of the campaign. Furthermore, the costs of producing advertising for, and procuring space in newspapers and on billboards and radio are very high, often running to thousands of dollars per insertion.

A breakdown of the major campaign expenditures shows that \$37,633 went for staff, \$14,562 for office expenses, \$21,838 for billboards, \$59,682 for mailings, \$20,079 for newspaper advertising, \$14,807 for radio ads, and \$20,000 for miscellaneous (postage, travel, registration, etc.). As you can see, \$193,582 went for communication with the constituency and for permitting candidates to spend their time meeting and talking with the public. No expenditure was improper and the total is not unusual for a hotly contested election in such a district.

While this comes to a lot of money, it must be remembered that any challenger must confront an incumbent who has office space, office equipment, stationery and supplies, a staff of nine people paid a total of about \$50,000, and the franking privilege to send mail free, all of which is used to put forth the incumbent's name, record, and activities, if not directly for "campaigning."

In my district, even more formidable obstacles were present. No Democrat had ever won in the district and the incumbent's last plurality was 62 percent and 41,000 votes. I had to go from a virtual unknown in this district to become a person whose record and positions could persuade many to bolt their party and support my candidacy.

It should be pointed out, too, that the money raised in this campaign was not used solely in my behalf. It was used to support the entire ticket, national and local. All candidates distributed literature through the offices and had their names displayed there.

The local candidates used the staff and offices and shared in the scheduling and all other activities. Registration efforts and work in bringing out the vote was for everyone's benefit. All participated.

I wish that "all this spending" had proved to be "unnecessary" as your editorial maintained. The fact is that the voters supported President Johnson, then returned to their normal Republican voting pattern to give Senator Keating a 10,000 vote plurality in my district. Were it not for the ability of me and my running mates to communicate our records and issues and to tie the incumbents with Senator Goldwater, it is at best doubtful that the voters would have returned to row B to give me a 27,000 vote plurality and elect a Democratic State senator and two assemblymen in the district.

You express concern over the fact that the great majority of the campaign funds were contributed by my family and me. Where is a candidate to go for the money necessary for the expense of communication? There is no prospect of the public contributing this kind of money, although we made every effort to obtain wide support and did, in fact, raise publicly more than \$20,000.

There should be some means of encouraging wide public involvement in financing campaigns. The Government should participate. The late President Kennedy proposed a \$15 tax credit and maximum \$1,000 deductibility for political contributions. I heartily endorse such a reform and will give it top priority in my legislative program.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Congressman-Elect.

[From the New York Herald Tribune,
Dec. 28, 1964]

OTTINGER AND THE ISSUES

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

Fortunately for the citizens of Westchester and Putnam Counties, the attempt to unseat our new Congressman, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, will prove only what Mr. OTTINGER already knows so well: it costs a lot of money to run for office these days.

DICK OTTINGER left the Peace Corps to accept the Democratic nomination for Congress in the 25th District before the Republicans lost their minds and nominated Goldwater. The Democrats, while welcoming OTTINGER as a candidate, were not about to invest cash in trying to elect a newcomer over Representative Robert Barry, who was habitually returned to office.

But OTTINGER's campaign was like a freshening breeze. He made an issue of the Hudson River and its pollution; he tried to stop Consolidated Edison from gouging up the Hudson Highlands with a powerplant; growing blight of decaying towns and commuter transportation were other issues.

In my life as a Westchester Republican, I never heard such talk from a candidate—modern, civilized sense. And the voters were given an opportunity to vote for somebody while uniting to stamp out Goldwater.

Regardless of the money OTTINGER's family spent on his campaign, it was issues that put him in office—and the good luck to have a Goldwater sycophant running against him.

The laws governing election campaign expenditures are, like many of our tax, divorce and birth control laws, so stupid, inequitable and inapplicable that they frequently do not deserve, nor do they get, the respect or attention of rational people. There are unsavory things about an election campaign. But there were two good things about the last election: Goldwater didn't get in, and OTTINGER did.

WILLIAM RODGERS.

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, N.Y.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald-Statesman, Jan. 2, 1965]

BRANDS ATTACKS ON OTTINGER'S ELECTION OUTLAY VICIOUS

To the HERALD-STATESMAN:

I am shocked at the intemperate and vicious attacks leveled against our newly elected Congressman RICHARD OTTINGER before he has even taken his seat in the House.

Wouldn't it be fairer for our Republican friends to hold their partisan blasts against the first Democrat elected in this district in decades until his record in the Congress is clear?

This business about election spending is pure nonsense, and no one knows it better than the Republican leaders. Congressional candidates of all political stripes must and do spend far in excess of \$8,000 on their own and related campaigns. There is no rule against this if it is properly done. Rest assured if there was, a healthy percentage of the Congress including members from all parties would be seated in violation of law.

The entire matter of campaign spending is an apparent smokescreen. What the Republican leaders are upset about is that a traditionally "safe" congressional seat has gone to an attractive young Democrat.

MICHAEL F. MAYER.

[Letter addressed to the Ossining (N.Y.) Citizens Register, Jan. 5, 1965]

To the CITIZENS REGISTER:

The critics of RICHARD L. OTTINGER's congressional campaign expenditures brush quickly past the problem of communication in a suburban district of 250,000 voters. They ignore altogether how severely the problem is compounded for the candidate whose party's registration averages 30 percent.

Leaving aside the legal questions, about which we have insufficient information, some of the conditions of suburban campaigning which the critics overlook, are these:

Prior to OTTINGER, no Democrat came even close to winning the 25th District. Most professional politicians in both parties would agree, I believe, that personality has not played a decisive role in the hitherto endless string of Republican victories. The Democratic candidates in recent years have been at least as able as the GOP incumbent, and not remarkably different in program or personality, from Mr. OTTINGER.

The biggest Democratic problem in the 25th District is reaching 250,000 voters, particularly with the registration 3-to-1 Republican. (I say "Democratic problem" because the incumbent with his franking privilege, reaches all of his constituents regularly.) These quarter of a million people are spread out over 50 miles, at least half of them scattered in one-family homes. The bulk of the working population travels many miles away from home every day. The radio they hear, the TV they see, the newspapers they read on the way to work, hardly cover at all the life of the 25th Congressional District.

Thus, the minority candidate starts off with 7 out of 10 against him. There is no single, effective way (even an expensive one), to reach large numbers of voters. He has to go to the people—250,000 of them—personally, more than half of them, 1 house at a time.

How many can afford to quit work in February, as Mr. OTTINGER did, and spend 18 hours a day from March to November, every day, visiting every village, town, and city? Is it any wonder that before 1964 not even a Democratic presidential landslide could beat such odds? Yet anything else has meant certain defeat.

As to the argument that with President Johnson heading the ticket, Mr. OTTINGER

didn't need to spend so much, there is considerable contrary evidence. An able Democrat who did not have Mr. OTTINGER's resources, lost decisively in the adjoining 26th District, despite President Johnson. Excellent Democrats running for the State senate and assembly on spartan budgets, lost in the same villages and towns where DICK OTTINGER won. With \$200,000 to spend, and able to take the time off to use himself as well, OTTINGER could get to these places personally many times, not to mention the dozens of times he came there by billboards, newspaper ads, and mailings. Why then is it that the one thing OTTINGER and his runningmates had in common—President Johnson—was enough for him, but not for them?

It seems to me that the answer is that Mr. OTTINGER did what every candidate, particularly from a minority party, must do to stand even an outside chance of winning. It is obviously a disgrace that he had to spend \$200,000 to do it. But I submit that the disgrace is not his, but our system's.

It is tough enough to get good Democratic candidates to run in Westchester County. If the rare one with money is now to be criticized for using it, we will really have a one-party system.

Mr. OTTINGER's story is neither a Westchester nor a Democratic problem. It surely applies in many parts of the country where good Republicans stand little chance against a 70-percent Democratic registration. The solution does not lie in penalizing the rare rich candidate, nor in unrealistic spending ceilings. The answer can only come from Federal-State financed campaigns, patterned after the English system.

Until then, let us elect good candidates, without money if we can, with it if we must. But good candidates.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM KLEIN II.

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, N.Y.

[Letter addressed to the New York Times,
Dec. 23, 1964]

To the EDITOR:

In your editorial, "The Ottinger Campaign," in referring to Mr. OTTINGER, you state: "An otherwise attractive young man starts his political career under a cloud." This statement is unduly harsh and unfair to Mr. OTTINGER, not only because, as you point out, "his case is by no means unique"—but if Mr. OTTINGER is to be beholden to anyone for campaign contributions, it is far better—from the standpoint of the public interest—that he be beholden to his family rather than to groups who might make demands upon him to serve their special interests.

Considering the huge sums spent in the recent election and raised from sources other than candidates' families, apparently lack of family or personal financial background has not restricted access to office (about which you were concerned) by many candidates. The crux of this matter is: Whose money helped elect the candidates; and, what will donors expect in the way of service and "favors" from successful candidates? In the past, some candidates have paid off their election obligations at the taxpayers' expense in the form of legislation, jobs, contracts, etc.

I am sure that neither Mr. OTTINGER's mother nor sister will receive any political favors or payoffs, or anything that will cost the taxpayer a single penny. Just because he did not pass around the hat among contributors who might, in the normal course, want favors or special privileges, Mr. OTTINGER should start off his congressional career with a minimum of obligations to specific groups. I hope that it might be said that he wears no man's collar. This should permit him to serve his district and his country more effectively and objectively.

Rather than condemn contributions made by Mr. OTTINGER's family, everything possible should be done to encourage the election of such intelligent, honest and dedicated young men, as Mr. OTTINGER, particularly if they can be elected with a minimum or, possibly, no financial obligations to the "bosses" or "special interest groups."

Sincerely,

LEON COLE.

NEW YORK CITY.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

For three centuries the tragic story of these people has been written into the history books. During most of that time misery and misfortune have been their lot, and they have been allowed no voice in their destiny.

This is no less true today than it has been in the past.

Since the middle of the 17th century, except for a brief period between 1918 and 1920, this nation of over 40 million industrious, gifted, and gallant souls, has not been allowed to enjoy freedom and independence. For centuries Ukrainians have been held down by the unrelenting hands of alien despots. They have endured hardships and privations; they have been ruthlessly oppressed and persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming of, and cherishing their freedom.

Yet, no oppressive measure, no amount of severe persecution has forced them to abandon their yearning for freedom. These oppressions and persecutions succeeded in uniting the Ukrainians against their foes, and, toward the end of the First World War, when the czarist Russian regime was overthrown, these brave people proclaimed their independence. On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Republic was founded.

Unfortunately, this Republic was surrounded by powerful and greedy foes, all eager to take over. Early in 1920 it was attacked by Russian Communist forces and soon overrun. The Ukraine's independence was brought quickly to an end and it was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Since then, for more than 44 years, the Ukraine has been submerged in the vast Soviet empire and the Ukrainian people have suffered under Soviet totalitarianism. They have borne the heavy yoke of the Kremlin longer than other minority group in the U.S.S.R. The Communist regime, hard on all nationality groups there, has been particularly harsh on the individualistic and independent spirited Ukrainian population.

Fortunately, not even the Communist dictatorship has been able to break the spirit of freedom that still exists within these people. They have struggled against their oppressors and have fought with all the means at their disposal.

On this 47th anniversary celebration of their independence day we must wish them continued fortitude and power in their fight for freedom and liberty.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY ACT OF 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 2981, entitled, "Housing for the Elderly Act of 1965," is in the form of much needed amendments to present laws recommended by persons and organizations with years of experience in planning, financing, building, and management of large and successful nonprofit housing for the elderly.

The Nation's housing for the elderly is no longer in the experimental stage. Many millions of dollars have been spent in the 8 years of the program, yet the surface has hardly been scratched in providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing at rentals the majority of the elderly can afford.

Public housing for the elderly, it has been found, is not the answer. It is resented by the community and considered a modern version of "over the hill to the poorhouse," by the elderly themselves. Government-owned and managed housing becomes institutionalized and lacks the love and understanding that only private, nonprofit interest, efficiently operated, can furnish, if properly financed and encouraged.

A number of sincere groups had the courage to sponsor nonprofit housing for the elderly seeking to bring about quality, low-rent housing. Some of these projects are in financial difficulties because of the rental charge set by the Government in order to make the project a financial success. The rents charged are too high for the great majority of the elderly on low, fixed incomes, therefore the projects suffer from lack of occupancy.

It would be much cheaper for the Government to forestall their failure by offering a modest monthly subsidy to enable such projects to meet their obligations and, at the same time, permit low-income elderly to live in these developments.

First. Therefore, my bill, H.R. 2981, provides that the Administrator may enter into a contractual agreement with the owner, after construction, for payments not to exceed \$10 a month or \$120 a year per living unit.

Second. My bill places the two housing programs for the elderly together,

under the skilled and experienced FHA personnel in this field, thereby saving costly duplications of administration, and so forth.

Third. It establishes a much needed Board of Appeals to give sponsors, and so forth, the opportunity for a fair hearing if their applications are not acted upon within a reasonable time or if they are dissatisfied with the action accorded by local offices of the FHA and CFA.

Fourth. Much of the success of this type of project depends upon timely completion when the owner can move in renters to create an income to meet debt service obligations. Under my bill the contractor is required to post a completion bond with additional sureties providing penalties in the event of failure to complete the project on time.

Fifth. Furnishings, fixtures, and equipment needed to operate a housing for the elderly project is included in the loan provisions under my bill. Most nonprofit corporations, because of the nature of being nonprofit, should not be compelled to assume unreasonable obligations along with the responsibilities they are required to meet by the Government agencies.

Sixth. The age for occupants are lowered from 62 years of age, and over, to 60 years of age, and over. The average age of occupants living in elderly housing is 74 years. The lowering of the age by 2 years will encourage younger part-time employed persons to live in such housing.

Seventh. Owners are reluctant to rent to those on public assistance because of the undependency of their income. My bill provides, upon permission from the recipient, payments may be made directly to the owner by local welfare agencies, where permitted by law.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include copy of a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks following my own on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Friday, January 22, 1965, marked the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. Because of the inaugural festivities, it was thought best to hold our annual observance in the House today, January 25. As in prior years, in both the House and the Senate, the elected representatives of the American people take this memorable occasion to express the deep feeling of affinity and common purpose

we hold for the captive nation of some 45 million Ukrainians.

We share with them the ideals of real democracy, national self-determination, and individual liberty and in many ways truly support their undying aspirations for freedom and national independence.

OCCASION FOR HOUSE RESOLUTION 14

On this significant occasion of the 47th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, I deem it necessary to go beyond the realm of sincere expressions of thought and feelings by advancing a concrete proposal that would aid immensely in the eventual liberation of Ukraine—indeed, all other captive nations—from the imperio-colonialist heel of Moscow. I know that by offering the adoption of House Resolution 14, a measure to establish a desperately needed Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, my proposal for specific and concrete action bespeaks also the desires of numerous Members of this body, who in the 87th Congress, in the 88th Congress, and in the present 89th Congress have joined in submitting similar resolutions. This congressional observance of Ukrainian independence affords us the excellent opportunity in this Congress to urge the necessary creation of this special committee.

Mr. Speaker, in a move which I believe touches the heart of every Ukrainian patriot—in fact, the hearts of all our captive allies in the Red totalitarian empire—I take this important occasion to urge the immediate adoption of House Resolution 14, a copy of which will be found at the end of my remarks.

THIS 47TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Speaker, the national histories of east European peoples are full of miseries and misfortunes, and the history of the Ukrainian people is no exception. Since the signing of a compact between the Russian czar and the Ukrainian leaders in 1654, stouthearted and liberty-loving Ukrainians have not been allowed, except for periods in the 18th century and the brief 2-year period of 1918–20, to enjoy the benefits of free and independent life in their historic homeland.

Through the turns and twists of fateful international events, some 45 million Ukrainians have not been permitted to be masters of their fate. For too long a period they have been held down under the oppressing yoke of alien despots. They have endured hardships, privations, and indescribable miseries. They have been ruthlessly persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming and cherishing their independence and freedom.

Yet, no oppressive measure, no amount of severe persecution could compel them to abandon their yearning for freedom. Instead, oppressions and persecutions have united the Ukrainians against their foes, held them together. Then toward the end of the First World War, when the decrepit czarist regime was overthrown, and Austria's hold over the western Ukraine was broken, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

This historic event took place on the memorable 22d of January 1918—47

years ago. That day has become a landmark in the history of Ukraine, and remains the brightest spot in their struggle for freedom and independence. Unfortunately, the newborn republic was suffering under severe handicaps. It was surrounded by powerful foes, ready to pounce upon it and put an end to its existence. And that is what happened even before the joy and jubilation had ceased.

Before the Ukrainian people had any time to recoup their losses, they were attacked by their inveterate foes, Moscow and its Red army. Early in 1920 enemy forces entered and occupied the eastern part of the country; soon the whole country was overrun and all Ukrainian opposition was ruthlessly crushed. Then in the fall of that year Ukraine became a satellite of Soviet Russia, and by 1933 it was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Since those fateful days, for nearly five decades, Ukraine has been submerged in the Soviet Russian Empire, and the Ukrainian people have suffered grievously under Moscow's totalitarianism. For all practical purposes the country is sealed off from the free world. Neither the people of Ukraine are allowed in large numbers to travel abroad, nor are the people of the free world, except under carefully guided Communist supervision, able to go to Ukraine.

Thus, the country has become a large prison house for its people. Their most cherished possession is their spirit of freedom. Inhuman Kremlin agents have resorted to every device to deprive the Ukrainian people of this possession, but fortunately they have not succeeded in their task. Today, even under the most relentless of Soviet Russian totalitarian tyrannies, the sturdy and stouthearted Ukrainian clings steadfastly to his national ideals and still preserves his fervent love for freedom and independence.

The Ukrainian people, in and out of their homeland, have been a boon to the communities in which they lived. In this country they have been noted for their industry, ingenuity, and tenacity for hard work in whatever vocation. They have never shunned heavy labor in preference to something less arduous. In this respect their tough and resilient physiques, and their tenacious nature have served them well.

Hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic, and hardworking Americans of Ukrainian origin have always given excellent accounts of themselves in this country. I can say this because I have known many of them in my Congressional District, and have seen them at work. These people of stolid character have contributed their full measure to the free and democratic way of life in this great Republic. They have been a positive force in the building of our democratic institutions, and they have always been ready to fight and die for the preservation of these institutions.

Today, on this solemn occasion, I am happy to join them in the celebration of the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit at this point a copy of the

aforementioned House Resolution 14, 89th Congress:

H. RES. 14

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "non-interference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely

subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1965, marked the 47th anniversary of the proclamation establishing a free and independent Ukrainian National Republic. Because freedom is stifled today in the Ukraine, it is just and appropriate for us to observe this anniversary and to speak up for those who are silenced by Russo-Communist tyranny. Today, we pay tribute to the 45 million people of the Ukraine and those Ukrainian sons and daughters who have come to our shores and made such a worthy contribution to our culture and national heritage.

The independence and freedom of the Ukrainian National Republic were of short duration, but its commemoration remains as a steadfast reminder that that freedom burns brightly as it did in 1918 despite long years of tyranny and oppression. No despot, however cruel, can extinguish the yearning for liberty that dwells in the hearts of men. The Ukraine has been forced to submit to manmade famine, religious suppression, cultural control, purges, and deportations. Yet, no one has broken the spirit of these people who have so long labored under the yoke of Soviet domination.

The Ukrainians have retained their strong national feelings and have lived and worked according to the traditions of their heritage. National resistance to Soviet domination has ever been uppermost in their minds and actions.

The crimes of the Soviet Russian leadership against the Ukrainians assumes an overwhelming significance in this modern day. Lest this plight be forgotten, let us take this opportunity to reaffirm our own dedication to freedom, and assure the Ukrainian people, along with all others held captive under the hand of Communist oppression, that we have not forgotten them, and that we do not accept their enslavement as final. We are confident the sun of freedom will again shine upon them and that they will take their place—as is their God-given right—in the community of free and sovereign nations.

On this solemn anniversary day of Ukrainian independence, I join my colleagues and millions of Americans in wishing the Ukrainian people everywhere, fortitude and power in their struggle against the forces of tyranny, and express hope that they attain their supreme goals of freedom and national independence with justice for all.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. If I am not mistaken, Mr. Speaker, this is the gentleman's maiden speech as a Member of the House of Representatives. We wish for him great success here and many years of tenure in which to continue these remarks.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, this occasion is an excellent one for us to remind ourselves of the imperio-colonialist bondage in which over 117 million non-Russians—Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Armenians, and many other nationalities in the U.S.S.R.—find themselves today. It has been most mystifying to all knowledgeable Americans as to why our representatives in the United Nations have remained silent on this fundamental issue while the United States has been excoriated for imperialism and colonialism in the Congo, Vietnam, and elsewhere. On this issue I commend to the reading of

my colleagues the following article written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "Dominant Russian and American Problems in the Cold War." I request that this article, which was recently published in the authoritative journal of East European and Asian affairs, the *Ukrainian Quarterly*, be printed at this point in the RECORD:

DOMINANT RUSSIAN AND AMERICAN PROBLEMS IN THE COLD WAR

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Now that President Johnson has been elected for a 4-year term, the eyes of all Americans who are deeply and intelligently concerned with the steady progress made by the Sino-Russian imperialist combination in the cold war are fixed more than ever on the dominant problems confronting both Moscow and Washington. The problems are numerous; they are economic, political, ideological and scientific, but despite their character, they will in great part be viewed against the background of conceptions revealed by the President himself. With an expected sharp turn of events, it wouldn't at all be surprising to witness his reverting back to a position taken in the last decade: "We should keep our strength ready, the strength we are now building. If anywhere in the world—by any means, open or concealed—communism trespasses upon the soil of the free world, we should unleash all the power at our command upon the vitals of the Soviet Union."¹

Since these words were uttered, there has been a great deal of trespassing on the soil of the free world. Whole territories in Cuba, Tibet, and elsewhere have been taken over by both Moscow and Peking. Regardless of the presence of nuclear weapons, which obviously doesn't deter their concealed aggressions against the free world, there is grave doubt that the President's current conceptions of the struggle can cope with the swiftly moving changes abroad. Take, for example, his notion about good Communists and bad ones: "It is true . . . that communism is a danger. But Russia is a different kind of danger from Yugoslavia. A small Communist Party in Africa is a different danger from the Government of Red China."² It would seem from this that no Communist conspiracy exists, that we needn't worry about any venomous tentacles, only the heart.

Another false conception is that of personality diplomacy. We oriented our policy toward the Soviet Union rather heavily on the whims and caprices of Khrushchev. Indeed, upon his downfall the President even praised him for joining in the nuclear test ban treaty, in the hot line, and in agreeing on a nuclear-free space. "In these actions," stated the President, "he demonstrated good sense and sober judgment."³ Only the future will tell whether we exercised "good sense and sober judgment" in all this. Aside from the terrible real costs of any technologic breakthrough on Moscow's part that we may yet sustain, the costs of maintaining safeguards since the treaty went into effect keep soaring at close to a billion dollars a year.

In that same address, speaking of turmoil in the Communist world, the President declared "this great change will not stop the forces in Eastern Europe that are working for greater independence. Those forces will continue to have our sympathy. We will not give up our hope of building new bridges to

¹ Senator Johnson, Lyndon B., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 8, p. A127.

² President Johnson, text, Al Smith dinner, New York, Oct. 14, 1964.

³ Address, the Washington Post, Monday, Oct. 19, 1964, p. A10.

these peoples." Are these bridges with the oppressive governments or with the captive nations, the peoples themselves? So far it has been with the former and as such has undermined the forces working for greater independence. With an anticipated consolidation of the Sino-Russian Empires, where will bridges be extended then?

An additional favorite Presidential conception that will be exploded in the not too distant future is that of random evolution. "All political systems change," states Johnson. "They are forced to by historic circumstances. It would be dangerously foolish to believe that Soviet Russia or Communist China will soon become open societies. But it would be equally foolish to think they will never change." Change how?—essentially or accidentally. The United States has been in constant change, yet in the essence of its democracy it is changeless. So with the totalitarian systems of the Soviet Russian and Red Chinese Empires, they are changing by the day, but not away from their totalitarian essence. History is made; it just doesn't merely happen, with all of us changing accordingly.

To depend on such conceptions for the future would be defeating, indeed. The removal of Khrushchev from power signalizes both the collapse of the policy of accommodation, as pursued by Kennedy and Johnson, and the move for empire solidarity. Red Chinese and Soviet Russian cooperation will spearhead wars of liberation in the underdeveloped areas. Strengthened within, every attempt will be made by the solidified Sino-Russian Empire to intensify disintegrative forces in Western Europe, southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It didn't take long for Poland's Gomulka and Hungary's Kadar to fall in line with the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime. Others will rapidly fall in line, too. Meantime, Moscow has received Peking's staunch ally in Europe. Soon Moscow and Tirana will be exchanging ambassadors. The trend is on and the problems facing Moscow and Washington will be greater than ever.

THE NATURE OF PROBLEMS

Now, every body politic has problems. This has always been; it will always be. We in the United States are beset with a full spectrum of problems, ranging from a shot to the moon to the employment of every willing and able worker. The Soviet Union has even greater problems, not only those normally associated with day-to-day existence in a developing industrial society but also—indeed more so—those created by the totalitarian goals, drives, and energies of what is commonly called Russian communism.

In a valid sense, then, the problems of Russian communism, totalitarian in nature and scope, constitute an additional layer to the everyday problems engulfing those who are directly or indirectly under the influence of Moscow. Yes, there are problems of juvenile delinquency, skilled labor shortages, alcoholism, urban development and a host of other socio-economic phenomena as there are here and in numerous other countries. But to pose these as the distinctive, direct problems of Russian communism would mean to lose sight of the forest because of the trees. To be sure, in any totalitarian framework the impact of broader, overall problems is felt in the lower range of particular, day-to-day problems—creating some, sustaining others, and intensifying most. But to comprehend as best we could the total, integrated picture of the problems of Russian communism, and thus those facing us, it is necessary to distinguish between

the truly totalistic problems and the particular derivative problems, with primary concentration on the former.

Methodically, then, for us to view the picture of the problems of Russian communism as an integrated whole, we shall survey six selective categories, each in turn predicating a variety of interrelated problems. More, to assess the meaning of these aggregate problems both for the achievement of Moscow's goals and the realization of capable responses on our part, we shall throughout stress their operational significance in the context of traditional Russian cold war activity.

THE IDEOLOGICOPROPAGANDA PROBLEM

The six problem areas for our analysis are: (1) the ideologicopropaganda, (2) the imperial-colonial, (3) the economic area, (4) the military-space field, (5) the party apparatus, and (6) Soviet Russian totalitarianism. Let us consider the first, the ideologicopropaganda. The strength of Moscow's ideologicopropaganda drive is admitted as being superior by most students of the subject. Moscow's tremendous feat in this all-encompassing area is the sustained impression and opinion generated in too many parts of the free world that a new way of life, a new philosophy, and new methods and operations of social order are represented by the Soviet Union and other sectors of Moscow's empire. The way of life is socialism in transition to communism; the philosophy is Marxism-Leninism with unspecified revisions now and then; and the new methods and operations are ostensibly the products of a planned economy. Our personalist way of life, our democratic philosophy, and our capitalist methods and operations stand in contradiction to these essentials of so-called Soviet society.

Moscow's strategists have enlarged this ideologicopropaganda achievement by convincing many unsuspecting Americans and others that the momentous contest is between two social systems—socialism versus capitalism—in the atmosphere of "peaceful coexistence" which, by definition, means cold war and Soviet Russian takeover right down the line. We are supposed to be in an economic and technologic race, the outcome of which is predestined by Moscow's interpretation of history. As in the case of Hitler and his 1,000 years of the new order, the Russian totalitarians see themselves riding the wave of the future.

To prevent this, we spend considerable time, capital and energy in the simple belief that we are fighting international communism or, at best, Communist imperialism. Clouding up the situation further is the notion that our adversary is the Soviets—mind you, councils of workers and peasants. No one will deny here that to confuse, deceive, and distract your chosen opponent is a basic accomplishment in and of itself. As concerns the nature of the struggle and its manifold ramifications, the Russian totalitarians have succeeded in this with us. In the past Russian tyrants cloaked their totalitarian rule and imperialist conquests with equally spurious ideologies of super-religious orthodoxy and racist pan-Slavism. Today it is millenarian communism, interspersed at times with these old ideologies in what suits the occasion.

We have uncritically accepted this and inadvertently impute philosophic respectability and dignity to what is essentially not the ideology but the mythology of communism. The pendulumic swings of attitude in the United States, viewing the Russians as 4-footers at one time and then 11-footers at another, indicate both our uncertainty of knowledge and susceptibility to Moscow's manipulation of half or isolated truths. On the one hand, we deprecate Moscow's activities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America as mere propaganda, while, on the other hand,

we complain that our story is not reaching the university students and the peoples of these areas. We have still to appreciate the central importance and significance of propaganda in the cold war. The heirs of Pushkin, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, and other practical psychologists have remarkably developed this basic art to make a relatively backward state appear as a prime contender to the American giant, to make the worst empire of its kind appear as the great proponent of national liberation and independence, and to move the minds of millions throughout the world in the belief that all this is so.

However, the problems of Moscow's ideologicopropaganda are deep and fundamental. These have been time and time disclosed by experience and events, not theory or speculation. How often have you heard about Communist indoctrination of the youth and a captive population? Well, after 20 years of so-called indoctrination millions of Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, and others deserted colonial Moscow in World War II; after 10 years of heavy propaganda Hungarian students and workers staged the 1956 revolution, shouting "Russky, go home"; after years of enslavement in the Vorkuta, Karaganda, and other labor correction camps, inmates of all different nations struck for freedom.

Month after month, Pravda and Izvestia hammer away at the need for heavy indoctrination in the schools, in the armed services, and in the republics to overcome what is in effect hollow babble. On Lenin's birthday in 1963, B. N. Ponomarev, the party historian and secretary of the Central Committee, delivered an address designed to justify Soviet Russian policy under Khrushchev. The basic principles of revolutionary theory, he said, are loyalty toward Marxism-Leninism—determined struggle against the dogmatic strangulation of the theory; indissoluble union between theory and practice, their organic unity within the scope of all party activities. In other words, like Lenin with Marx, Moscow's colonialists can interpret Lenin as conditions warrant it.

These are only a few of the hundreds of examples proving the utter bankruptcy of what we uncritically call Communist ideology. Without Iron, Bamboo, and Sugar Curtains, walls, and the oppressive apparatus of totalitarian rule this existential bankruptcy would come into full bloom, the Hitlerian totalitarian and imperialist nature of so-called communism would be clear to all, this Trojan Horse of thought and weapon of deception with no basic relevancy to 19th-century Marxism would become transparent even to the newly independent nations and peoples who know little about Soviet Russian impericocolonialism.

Nevertheless, Moscow continues to capitalize on this massive deception chiefly because of our failure to recognize its own problems in waging this ideologicopropaganda offensive. Such development requires a realization of the central importance of propaganda—a forceful, well-planned propaganda of truth and fact—and also a grasp of the real nature of the threat stemming from Eastern Europe. Our Voice of America is but a pygmy compared to Moscow's media. Worse still, the policies of USIA run counter to the task of recognizing and aggravating these problems in the U.S.S.R. For example, 6 years ago, by virtue of congressional hearings, the USIA was stopped in its attempt to curtail and eliminate Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Georgian, and other non-Russian broadcasts to the U.S.S.R.⁵ It sought to have the captive non-Russian peoples under the heel of Soviet Russian impericocolonialism listen in the language of their Moscow captor.

⁴ President Johnson, Lyndon B., address, the Mormon Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, Oct. 28, 1964.

⁵ "Review of U.S. Information Agency," Committee on Foreign Affairs, October 1958, Washington, D.C., pp. 102-122.

The opportunities for projecting the ideologico-propaganda problems of Moscow are many. For one, we could easily show the theoretic Russian perversion of Marxism and the vanity of so-called Communist ideology. Points on economic determinism, the technocratic elite in the U.S.S.R., the appeal to underdeveloped areas in the name of socialism, surplus value, economic and colonial exploitation in the Soviet Union, state versus society, are only a few to establish the Russian mythology of communism. As one writer puts it, "Bolshevism evidently stems from the traditional messianic and universalist outlook of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia which fastened upon Marxism as an instrument of its own will to change the world."⁸ The fact is that Soviet Russian mythology is a Comtean impulse to reorganize wholesale the societies of other nations in the image of barbarian Russian institutions.⁷ The combination of oppressive institutions and modern technology, the latter largely the creation of the West, has produced a mythology which in every fundamental respect is Hitlerian totalitarianism.

If we are to win the cold war, we must recognize and repeatedly stress the real threat which Soviet Russian mythology conceals. And this is the Soviet Russian imperio-colonial system of totalitarian rule. Our most powerful weapon against this last remaining empire in the world is the ideology, the system of ideas and truths, embodied in our own Declaration of Independence. About 10 years ago we called for a universalization of the declaration, aimed particularly at the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.⁹ The evidence of this past decade proves the soundness of this position. However, when we find Secretary of State Rusk declaring in a letter to the House Rules Committee in 1961 that Ukraine, Armenia and Georgia are traditional parts of the Soviet Union, meaning, in effect, that we should not disturb Moscow's eminent domain over these captive areas, we cannot but wonder about the understanding and vision of some of our leaders, many of whom are today seeking a nonaggression pact with Moscow and a virtual sellout of the captive nations.¹⁰ Three months later Ambassador Stevenson in a U.N. declaration talks about an "independent Ukrainian Republic," about an Armenia that "declared its independence" in 1918, about "the independent state of Georgia."¹¹

Clearly, it is such confusion of thought that inhibits us from recognizing the problem Moscow has in shielding its backward imperio-colonialism with Marxist ideology. It is such cross-purpose operation that causes men like Madariaga to say, "This is a war of ideas, brains and heart. The West's foreign policy is passive and flaccid. It will never get an understanding with Russia. How about Russian imperialism? It's the worst imperialism the world has ever known."¹² Now with Red China, another imperio-colonialist power, Moscow will advance in the free world behind the cloak of Marxism-Leninism.

⁸ Lichtheim, George, "Marxian: An Historical and Critical Study," New York, 1961, p. 398.

⁷ Dobriansky, Lev E., "Veblenism, a New Critique," Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1957, pp. 85-86.

⁹ "Universalized Declaration of Independence: America's New World Revolution," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 18, 1953.

¹⁰ "State Proves the Necessity of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 3583.

¹¹ "Spotlight on Moscow's Imperio-Colonialism," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 3569.

¹² Salvador de Madariaga, Washington Post, May 26, 1961.

THE IMPERIOCOLONIAL PROBLEMS

Well, how about Soviet Russian imperialism? The second general area of Moscow's foremost problems is its tremendous empire. Contrary to much current wishful thinking about Red China, Albania, and Rumania, about the slow fragmentation of the Communist bloc, the Soviet Russian Empire has continued to consolidate itself in substantial terms of economic coordination, military accretion, and an expedient exploitation of nationalist forces. One of Moscow's paramount goals in the past 5 years has been to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its present empire, and our increasing indifference toward the captive nations has helped in this. Today we can look forward to even greater Soviet Russian consolidation.

Since its accidental inception in 1917, Soviet Russia has reduced to captivity one non-Russian nation after another. The history of Soviet Russian conquest began with most of the nations now held in bondage within the Soviet Union itself—White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, and others—and this process, either directly or indirectly, continues in Cuba, South Vietnam, Laos, Iran, and elsewhere.¹³ The most significant development in all areas of the empire is the emphasis placed on the old formula "national in form, Socialist in content." To attract the instinctive nationalist forces in Poland, Ukraine, Hungary, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and elsewhere to the global ambitions of Moscow, the Russian totalitarians are accommodating themselves to the stress of national heroes and events of the past. In this they hope to prove that the future of these captive nations rests with them rather than the imperialist powers of the West. Moscow exploits past and present national grievances to its own advantage, constantly telling Poles and Ukrainians, for example, about the German atrocities of the past and constantly reminding Azerbaijani and Armenians about their claims against Iran and Turkey, respectively.

Moscow plays every angle to strengthen its hold on the empire, on both the internal captives within the Soviet Union and the outer captives outside it. Feelings of pan-Slavism, religious orthodoxy, national pride, past hatreds and national uncertainty toward the future are exploited. Past disagreements with Red China, Rumania, or Albania were more of a proof of this overall tendency of expedient accommodation than of any basic disintegrative tendency.

Those who today preach that the Soviet Russian Empire is showing signs of disintegration, that the future is with us that all that is required is a military build-up and trade with this empire are gravely misleading the citizens of this country. There is no substantial evidence of this. In fact all the important and basic evidence of increasing empire strength points the other way. Of course Moscow has its problems. Who doesn't? It had even graver problems at Stalin's death during the Hungarian Revolution but it nonetheless continued to build up its composite power.

Yet ingrained in this imperial power and strength lies the most profound problem of the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialists. This fundamental problem revolves about the immense latent power of genuine patriotic nationalism both within and outside the Soviet Union. This problem is so deep that despite his public disclaimers of Stalinist terrorism Khrushchev deemed it necessary to have two Ukrainian nationalist leaders in exile murdered.¹⁴ It is this power of

¹³ Dobriansky, Lev E., "History of Communist Aggression," report, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 1961, pp. 14-22.

¹⁴ George Vine, "I Killed for Russia," the Daily Mail, London, Nov. 18, 1961.

patriotic nationalism which is our most formidable weapon against Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism; not the superficial disagreements between puppet junior partners and the prime power. Despite the unmistakable clues given by former Russian Premier Khrushchev himself we have yet to translate this basic problem for general American understanding.

Turning now to the economic area it should be readily recognized that for cold war objectives the empire economy of the Soviet Union is strong secure and increasingly threatening. The usual comparisons about their surpassing us in this or that are of barren meaning a source of much economic illusion. The U.S.S.R. economy is and always has been a war economy in essence. With a gross imperial product of only about 40 percent of our GNP with an industrial output of about 55 percent of ours and requiring over 20 percent more labor, with an agricultural output below ours by one-third and requiring 40 percent of their labor force as against 10 percent of ours, with available goods and services only 33 percent of ours and on a per capita basis only 25 percent of ours, and with the inevitable problems of growth being experienced by them, Moscow has a long way to go to match our economy. However, being a totalitarian and essentially a cold war economy, the U.S.S.R. poses an increasing threat as \$12 to \$20 billion of additional output becomes annually available to it for cold and hot liberation war purposes.

Problems in this unbalanced economy are many, but most fundamental are the disparities of real income and status between the new class of the ruling elite and party functionaries and the underlying population, and also the rampant economic colonialism to which the captive non-Russian peoples are subjected. What the average factory worker in the United States receives in 1 week—a little over \$100—exceeds the average monthly wage in the U.S.S.R., about \$80.

Although living standards have improved in the last 6 years, they are far below those of any modern industrial economy. The shortage of adequate housing space, not to mention facilities, remains acute; and if the present 7-year plan succeeds, the average family in a large city would have about the same living space in 1965 that its forebears had in 1917. In 1961, upon announcing the 20-year draft plan, Khrushchev promised that by 1980 every newly married couple could expect a private apartment of its own.

Such basic maladjustments exist throughout this cold war-oriented economy—in industrial and agricultural production, transportation, communications, distribution, and economic organization. No doubt there are units in each that compare efficiently and brilliantly with the best plants we have. But unless we are wont to be deceived by Russian economic Potemkinism, every sphere lacks depth and proportionality in what for years has been a capital overstrained economy. This strain showed itself in 1961 with a marked decrease in the growth rate, that in 1962 is estimated to have been less than 4 percent.

In combination with these problems, the pressures exerted by the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. for a greater take in the economic pie represent nationalist resistance to Soviet Russian economic colonialism within the U.S.S.R. Moscow is now decrying localism and has launched another economic reorganization that has all the marks of Russification for the Baltic, Caucasian, and Turkestan areas.

These basic problems deserve our concentrated cold war attention. One of our main objectives should be the study and full disclosure of the scope and depth of Moscow's

economic colonialism in the Soviet Union.¹⁴ But so far the administration has resisted such a step, this despite all the evidence of Moscow's troubled concern over such studied interest.¹⁵

MILITARY-SPACE PROBLEMS

Contributing to the capital overstrain in the U.S.S.R. economy are the military-space problems facing Moscow. The general and specific strength of the U.S.S.R. in this area are the consummate result of top priority allocation in this war economy. Matching in dollar volume our total military expenditures over 20 percent of the gross produce in the U.S.S.R. goes to military pursuits. Every weapon, every means from ICBM's to pistols, receives high qualitative and quantitative development. In space exploration, tremendously expensive in itself, Moscow has, as we know, made an early start under the rule of inordinate concentration. In all these areas the technologic achievements are basically and almost entirely Western. They have little or nothing to do with so-called Socialist economy or Communist pretensions. Their further development poses, nevertheless, certain dangers, particularly in significant breakthroughs capable of magnifying the military power of the imperio-colonial tyrant.

But the innovation of present military-space technology in no way alters the persistent problems in the armed services of the U.S.S.R. Complete and striking military power is not just a conglomeration of new weapons. The ultimate weapon is still man and his morale, loyalties, and will. No one is more aware than Moscow of the overriding fact that, despite changing military technology, in all three major wars in this century the motley and multinational forces of the Russian Empire, whether Czarist or Soviet, disintegrated early. In the Russo-Japanese and the two World Wars, political factors associated with the freedom of the Russian people and the independence of the non-Russian nations, accounted for this record. About 43 percent of the U.S.S.R.'s armed forces is non-Russian and despite the fact that the constitution of the U.S.S.R. calls for separate Republic war ministries, troops are carefully intermixed and dispersed.

Our capitalization of this deep-seated problem rests obviously on a broader program directed at the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Along with this is the necessity for a full and superior development of all our arms, nuclear and conventional. Disarmament in the realistic context of the cold war is a political myth. The only sure and safe way to preserve the gray peace and to move forward toward cold war victory is by attaining to unquestioned superiority along the entire spectrum of military technology and weaponry. Our economy can flexibly accommodate this; the empire economy of the U.S.S.R. cannot. In space, we already enjoy an overall superiority. As in so many other respects, the Russians potemkinize their firsts and demonstrate in time their lack of depth. There is no common sense reason why we or the free world should cooperate and share our space discoveries with the Russian totalitarians. Whether we like it or not, even space is not excludable from the Russian cold war matrix.

THE PARTY APPARATUS

Another major problem area is the party apparatus. Not unlike the Nazi Party under Hitler, the Communist Party of the Soviet

Union is the cohesive agent of totalitarian Soviet Russian strength. There are some 9 million in the party today, but this figure is misleading. Predominantly Russian, the party consists of members with families, relatives and associates who, though not members, share both material and spiritual interests in the strength and power of the party. And these number well over 25 million. The party, thus, is the strong vehicle for totalitarian rule in the empire and for subversive conspiracy beyond it.

However, it is not without problems that, along with others, could not be worked on. The perennial problem of succession is uppermost today. Two heads in this empire won't last for long. There are, too, intra-party feuding, the pressures of national parties in Ukraine, Georgia, and elsewhere, and infiltration of party councils and machinery that lend themselves to our use in the cold war. Here, as elsewhere, our offensive in the cold war would necessarily have to be organic, composite, and totalistic. Pursuing one problem as against others would be foolish and wasteful. But it will be noted that involved in each of these major problems is the basic cross-sectional problem of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

SOVIET RUSSIAN TOTALITARIANISM

The final and perhaps cardinal problem of Russian communism is the maintenance of its nexus between Soviet Russian expansionism and internal totalitarianism. The former continues unabated by push and accomplishment, as in the case of Cuba. And, contrary to the false notion of progressive mellowism in the U.S.S.R., the latter is kept intact. Aside from terrorism, the totalitarian reins in the U.S.S.R. are as strong as ever. There has been no evidence of any democratization under Khrushchev, and allowable criticism is more administrative than institutional. As Khrushchev said in 1957, "I . . . wish to goodness every Communist could fight as Stalin fought." Logically, to allow any institutional democratization, Moscow would be consigning its whole imperial structure, including the U.S.S.R., to limbo. But this logic is no reason for us to hesitate in the enlargement of this problem by actively generating pressures within the U.S.S.R. toward the civil and political freedoms of the Russian people and the national freedoms of the non-Russian nations.

In short, the permanence of the cold war and the basic fixity of Soviet Russian totalitarianism are indispensable requisites to the preservation of Moscow's imperial domain, within and beyond the U.S.S.R. A limited nuclear test ban treaty is not even a shaft of light pointing to any cessation of the cold war. In fact, as Moscow proceeds to put its house in order by solving the major problems described here and resolving the Sino-Russian imperialist rift, we can look forward to more intense cold war efforts in the free world—this, of course, under the banner of a qualified peaceful coexistence. The hard line is the line of the future.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the eloquent remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for yielding, and I commend him for taking this time so that we might pause to pay tribute to the con-

tribution of Americans of Ukrainian descent and to remind ourselves of the unfinished business before us in connection with an independent Ukraine. It was a short-lived independence that the Ukraine enjoyed, but our hopes continue that at some time in the not too distant future we may again see the Ukrainian people winning back that independence.

I want particularly to commend the gentleman for the action he has referred to in his resolution to create in this House a Committee on Captive Nations. As he knows, I have joined with him in the past in introducing this resolution, and have again joined with him this year. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that in this 89th Congress we may perhaps be more successful than we have been in previous Congresses in creating this committee within this body.

It is easy for us to stand up year after year and pay tribute in words to this objective of an independent Ukraine, but we need action as well, and the creation of this kind of a committee is the kind of action that we as Members of the House of Representatives can take to underscore our firm belief that Ukrainian independence is not just a slogan, but continues to be an active goal and objective of American foreign policy. Some effort must be made in the development of those policies to keep in mind what needs to be done to reassure the independence of all captive peoples and to guide the State Department and the other branches of the executive end of the Government in their dealings with the Soviet Union and with other nations to bring this result about.

Those of us who share the belief of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to redouble our efforts in this new 89th Congress to establish this committee so that we can indeed in the not too distant future welcome the Ukraine back into the brotherhood of free and independent states.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from New York. During the years of this fight, I have always considered him one of the most forceful weapons in my arsenal.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I join those who have been associating themselves with and commending the distinguished and eloquent gentleman from Pennsylvania on his statement? The people of the Ukraine and other captive nations everywhere have as their champion in this House one of the most courageous, one of the most articulate spokesmen for human liberty in all the world.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is more than kind.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this very important subject before us today.

Mr. Speaker, today is the day when all Americans join their fellow citizens of

¹⁴ "Action on the Creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 11, pp. 15376-15383.

¹⁵ See "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 3, pp. 3518-3544.

Ukrainian descent in marking the anniversary of the renewal of the independence of Ukraine which was solemnly proclaimed by the Ukrainian Parliament on January 22, 1918, in the capital of the Ukraine, Kiev.

It is well that Americans should recognize and honor Ukrainian independence, for the Ukrainian people have spent centuries battling for that independence and after it was gained 47 years ago, it was again quickly lost.

It should be recalled that the independence and sovereignty of Ukraine were recognized by a number of states, including Soviet Russia. But the latter attacked Ukraine both by direct military aggression and by subversion and infiltration from within. After almost 3½ years of bloody and heroic struggle, Ukraine, deprived of all military, economic, and diplomatic assistance by the Western World, succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Communist Russia.

For the past four and a half decades Ukraine has remained under the Communist yoke of Moscow, but it never has surrendered the spirit of freedom, nor has it given up the hope for regaining its full national independence.

During the period of enslavement the Ukrainian people have demonstrated their love of freedom and independence by a series of uprisings and large-scale resistance movements such as the underground warfare of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army in World War II and after it. The Ukraine has continued its internal battle for independence and by doing so has forced Moscow to resort to masquerading this captive nation as independent and free.

Such a masquerade must be apparent to all the countries of the free world. It is part of the master plan of Russia to illustrate to the world that it is indeed paternalistic in its attitude toward enslaved people. Today, the Ukraine is not free. It is held in the bondage of Soviet communism, along with others of its sister, captive nations.

Therefore, let us take a moment today to pay honor to the desire of Ukrainians for freedom; a desire which has been alive under the harshest of oppression, for half of this century.

Moreover, let us intensify our efforts by deed and word to bring some hopeful feeling to the distressed people behind the Iron Curtain who would once again like to savor the joys of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, while we pause to pay honor to one of our captive nations, let us also pay tribute to one who in perilous times fought for the freedom of the entire world. This was the late Sir Winston Churchill, a man among very few who saw his name chronicled in history during the course of his own lifetime.

Mr. Churchill was a giant among great men and grand events, his hallmark being supreme tenacity in the face of adversity. Over and above this, he had a facility for bringing forth the best in men during times when it was most needed.

During World War II, he proved a great light in long hours of darkness; and because he remembered the high

purpose of freemen in their hour of trial, mankind will never forget Winston Churchill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukraine, and the 46th anniversary of the union of all Ukrainian lands into a free and sovereign republic of Ukrainian people.

It is appropriate that Americans should honor the Ukrainians on this day, for the Ukrainians are a worthy and virtuous people who have long been held in subjection.

Through the twists and turns of international events, the Ukrainian people, now numbering some 45 million persons, have been an independent nation for only 2 short years in the past three centuries.

An independent Ukraine was created in 1918 at the conclusion of World War I, and it is this anniversary which we note this month. Independence proved to be short lived, however, for in 1920 the armies of Soviet Russia invaded the young nation. After a heroic and bloody resistance, the Ukrainians were forced to surrender and relinquish their cherished independence.

The succeeding 47 years have been a time of extreme deprivation, but they have brought out the quality of courage that marks the Ukrainian character. The Russians have tried hard to quench the nationalistic fire of these individualistic people. But among the Ukrainians, the love of their national heritage remains intense and the desire for freedom continues undiminished.

Ukrainians in the West, and others in the Ukraine, have kept alive the flame of freedom, and have sought to unite all Ukrainians in their common desire for independence. In the forefront of this valiant battle has been the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, whose work deserves the respect and admiration of free people everywhere.

In Washington, D.C., there stands a monument to Taras Shevchenko, the beloved Ukrainian national poet, whose works have inspired Ukrainians throughout the world and have stirred the hearts of freedom-loving patriots in all lands.

His monument is an enduring reminder to us that the spirit of the Ukrainian freedom fighters lives on even though their land is enslaved. On this day of remembrance, Mr. Speaker, we Americans should express our concern and hope for the aspirations of the Ukrainians and all others who suffer under alien tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon all my countrymen to join me in a salute to those Ukrainian patriots, both here and in their fatherland, who remain dedicated to freedom and liberty.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is very important to have the assistance of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] and our majority leader.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I first speak for my constituents in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for his thoughtfulness in reserving this time and for giving his colleagues the opportunity to join with him in commemorating the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. The gentleman enjoys international respect as a fearless foe of communism, and his activity here today in the House is in pursuit of that purpose.

I also want to report to my colleagues that this past weekend afforded me the opportunity to meet with a large number of my constituents who had gathered in Rochester, N.Y., to observe this national day of the Ukrainian people. It was an impressive ceremony, held under the auspices of the Rochester branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. My good friend, William Andrushin, president of the Rochester branch, conducted the ceremony.

As a part of the celebration, seven Ukrainians who fought in the 1918 revolution against Communist Russia received medals for their valor from the Ukrainian Veterans Association. For that heroic exploit and for their continuing contribution to the welfare of their fellow Ukrainians, I am honored indeed to bring their names to the attention of my colleagues in the House. The seven men are: Rev. Stephen Hordecki, Dr. Lev Rubenger, Mr. Wasyli Kalichensky, Mr. Dymytro Masymiw, Mr. Dymytro Wysocky, Mr. Peter Jarysh, and Mr. Wasyli Pylyshenko.

In my remarks today, I would like to reemphasize the remarks it was my privilege to deliver before this gathering in my home community last night.

Our heritage of democracy and freedom makes it deserved and fitting that we salute the bravery of the Ukrainian people. Because Soviet oppression obstructs any observance of this Independence Day in the Ukraine, our voices on this occasion must be particularly loud and lusty so that these liberty-loving patriots may know our concern for their cause.

Despite hundreds of years of despairing domination under Russian imperialist rule, the Ukrainian desire for liberty is as strong as that of our own colonists in 1776. Though robbed of all freedoms except that of secret spirit, the Ukrainians continue undaunted in their struggle for national self-government.

Our unwavering principle, found at the heart of the Declaration of Independence, is that every nation has the undeniable right to determine its destiny. Thus, the American ambition always must be to help the Ukraine throw off the shackles of subjection and restore the liberty for which your people long.

Because it is my belief that we must reassert this principle, I reaffirm my pledge to work for the creation in Congress of a Special Captive Nations Committee. On the opening day of the 89th Congress, I introduced a bill for this purpose, and today in the House of Representatives on our official observance of Ukrainian Independence Day, I again

call on my colleagues for careful consideration of this important resolution.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I compliment him for taking this time to speak on a subject very important to every American and the free people the world over.

The pressures and demands of the 20th century forbid us to indulge in idle ceremony. Our times demand that the merits of men and ideals, habits and deeds be judged anew. So it is right and proper to ask, what significance does Ukrainian Independence Day have for us in 1965?

The answer is as old as the Declaration of Independence and as young as the emerging nations of Africa. We are proud carriers of what Jefferson called "the disease of liberty." We hold today as in the past that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, that men are endowed with a right to pursue happiness. And yet, like fish in water, there is a danger that we may take for granted that very thing which is most vital to us.

This Nation has not since its founding felt the weight of foreign oppression, and it is all too easy to forget that others have not been as fortunate. This Nation grew by the slow accretion of liberty-loving people who were one by one drawn to our shores. It is too easy to forget that Russia grew by the calculated enslavement of her peaceful neighbors. Moscow tries to foist on the world the illusion that the U.S.S.R. is a union of shared sentiment and culture. We hear glib references to the Soviet Union and the Soviet people, and it is easy to forget that these facile words conceal the fact that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is an empire of captive nations and different peoples. What incredible irony that we are denounced as imperialists for rescuing people in the Congo—while 45 million Ukrainians suffer under Russian tyranny.

Here then is the significance of this day of commemoration: it shows the world that we have not forgotten our heritage or the captive peoples' plight. It affirms that there are values common and valid for men everywhere; that the urgent desire for self-determination pervades the Ukraine as surely as it does Africa or Asia or the Americas, and that therefore neither weapons nor troops can long keep enslaved the brave Ukrainian people. Freedom shall come to them—not because it is written in any stars, but because it is written in the hearts of men.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the struggle against oppression rages in many parts of the world tolling a bitter cost in blood and misery. The forced deprivation of freedom of expression, freedom of belief, and freedom of association continues to witness the staunch indestructible spirit of human dignity.

On this day in Congress commemorating the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, let us reaffirm our

responsibility to those people whose courage stands a reminder to all freemen. On behalf of 43 million Ukrainian people, let us renew our dedication to the principles of self-determination and liberty.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of the First World War when the oppressive regimes of Russia and Austria were overthrown, the Ukrainians realized their opportunity for freedom, and proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 1918. That event marked the achievement of a centuries-old dream. Soon the Ukrainian Republic was set up, and the Ukrainian people were doing their utmost to rebuild their war-ravaged country and to create a safe haven for themselves. But they were not allowed to carry on their task. In 1920 the country was attacked and soon overrun by the Red army; then it was made part of the Soviet Union, thus putting an end to the Ukrainian Republic.

But even though the Republic ceased to exist many years ago, it lives on in the souls of tens of millions of Ukrainians, and they are as one in celebrating their independence day. I gladly join them on the 47th anniversary of celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, to the sound of Russian guns across the Dnieper, the Central Rada proclaimed the Fourth Universal and declared the complete independence of the Ukrainian State. This act was the culmination of a long struggle against the Moscow regime which had resorted to all possible measures to deny to the Ukrainian populace their national existence as a people with their own distinct culture.

This freedom was, however, shortlived for in 1920 the Red army again overran the country, and the Ukraine was brought under the control of the U.S.S.R.

In the years that followed, and up to the present time these courageous people have had to bear the burden of Communist tyranny, but the spirit and desire for freedom has not been eradicated from their minds and hearts. Their fight is our fight, and we must continue to support the Ukraine, and the other captive nations in their heroic effort so the principle of self-determination, rather than the sword of the Communist dictatorship, will again control their destiny.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in this observance of the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. It provides us, as Members of the Legislature of one of the great democratic nations of the world, an opportunity to commemorate the courageous efforts of other freedom-loving peoples to throw off the yoke of Communist despotism.

Anyone familiar with the history of the Ukrainian people must be inspired by their relentless struggle to gain their freedom. For over 250 years they have been oppressed by the czars and more recently by the Communists, but they still cling to the hope that freedom and independence will someday prevail in their beloved land.

In our time the brutal tide of Communist conquest has engulfed many free nations. But, despite the brutal oppression of godless communism, it has not been able to wipe out the liberty-loving spirit of those who live behind the Iron Curtain. Nowhere is this more evident than among the 40 million people of the Ukraine. Over the long years of subjugation, which saw their patriots liquidated, their citizens sent into slave labor camps, and their religious beliefs trampled upon, the Ukrainian people have courageously and stubbornly rebelled against their Communist masters.

The people of the Ukraine hold a special place in our hearts and in our prayers. Over a million Americans of Ukrainian descent have enriched our country with their culture, their spiritual values, their love of freedom, and their devotion. I have witnessed the importance of these contributions in our city of Buffalo where many Ukrainian-Americans live. I am acquainted, too, with the splendid efforts being made by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America to help and encourage those in their homeland.

The Ukrainian people have suffered much. They know hunger and poverty. They have seen their fertile lands ravaged. Yet the light of freedom that burns in the heart of every Ukrainian nationalist has not been extinguished. These people we have not forgotten. We shall not forget them, nor accept their present unhappy fate as permanent.

This anniversary is an appropriate occasion for us in America to make known to these brave people that we are wholeheartedly dedicated to the cause of human freedom, and we once again express our determination never to rest until freedom is restored to all the captive nations.

Let us continue our prayers and efforts for the liberation of the Ukraine as we look forward to the day when it will join us in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, this 47th anniversary of Ukraine's independence is a most propitious occasion for me to submit two important joint resolutions pertaining to the struggle of the Ukrainian nation for freedom and independence. The first is a resolution calling for the establishment of a section to be known as the Shevchenko Freedom Library in the Library of Congress; the second is a joint resolution for the creation of a captive nations freedom series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom, commencing with a Taras Shevchenko freedom stamp. I request the inclusion of the texts of these resolutions as part of my remarks:

H.J. Res. —

Establishing a section to be known as the Shevchenko Freedom Library in the Library of Congress

Whereas, in October 1964, our President declared: "Shevchenko well deserves the honors paid him. He was more than a Ukrainian—he was a statesman and citizen of the world. He was more than a poet—he was a valiant crusader for the rights and freedom of men"; and

Whereas, in March 1961, President John F. Kennedy stated: "I am pleased to add my

voice to those honoring the great Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko. We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage"; and

Whereas, in March 1963, President Kennedy also paid tribute to the world-renowned Shevchenko Scientific Society in these words: "My congratulations on the ninetieth anniversary of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and on your sustained program for support for distinguished scholarship. Among your members have been some of the great names in learning to whom the world owes an incalculable debt. May you continue to extend the frontiers of human knowledge in the years ahead"; and

Whereas, in September 1960, President Eisenhower approved and signed a resolution of Congress providing for the establishment of a lasting memorial to Shevchenko's works in behalf of world freedom and justice; and

Whereas, with understanding and vision, the Eighty-sixth Congress of the United States honored this outstanding freedom light by authorizing the erection of a Shevchenko statue on public grounds in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the initiative of Congress successfully nullified the exploitation of Shevchenko as a historic symbol by both Moscow and its colonial puppets and the vehement attacks of the latter against these farseeing acts have clearly proven the wisdom of the United States Government in properly claiming Shevchenko as a towering beacon in the march of freedom; and

Whereas for our times and struggles the universal significance of this revered poet and national hero was permanently established in a galaxy punctuated by other luminaries of freedom, such as his contemporaries Abraham Lincoln, the Italian Mazzini, the Pole Mickiewicz, the Hungarian Petofi, and others from different nations and soils; and

Whereas for our time and beyond, the supreme importance of Shevchenko's works rests in his early and heroic opposition to traditional Russian imperio-colonialism and in his courageous advocacy of the freedom of all captive nations in the Russian Empire, including the freedom of Jews and all peoples in bondage of suppression and slavery; and

Whereas our expanding American interest in the classic contributions of Shevchenko and their universal import can only receive full educational satisfaction by an accessible concentration of his voluminous works and all related studies at a facility of national convenience: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a section in the Library of Congress shall be established and designated as the Shevchenko Freedom Library. This library section shall contain all the works written by Taras Shevchenko, both in the original and translations, and all volumes related to his immortal contributions and contents therein. This library section shall be established with the expert cooperation of the Shevchenko Scientific Society.

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

H.J. Res. —

To provide for the creation of a Captive Nations Freedom Series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom, commencing with a Taras Shevchenko Freedom Stamp

Whereas in his 1964 Captive Nations Week Proclamation the President declared: "It is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the

United States of America for their just aspirations" and urged all Americans "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty"; and

Whereas since 1959 both President Dwight D. Eisenhower and President John F. Kennedy expressed similar thoughts and sentiments in their successive annual proclamations; and

Whereas the Eighty-sixth Congress of the United States honored Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet laureate, by authorizing the erection of a monument to him on public grounds in Washington, District of Columbia; and

Whereas the same Congress provided for a documentary biography of Shevchenko in tribute to the everlasting spirit and works of this freedom fighter of Europe; and

Whereas the unremitting condemnations and attacks by imperialist Moscow and its colonial puppets against these farseeing data clearly prove the wisdom of the United States Government in properly claiming this contemporary of Lincoln as one of freedom's outstanding lights; and

Whereas in 1961 the President of the United States paid respects to the ideals and immortal teachings of this former serf, whose poetry, art, and philosophy have deeply inspired the forty-five million Ukrainian nation in its aspirations to freedom and independence; and

Whereas the profound humanism of this champion of liberty was courageously directed against the colonial subjugation of all the non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, as well as against the suppression of the Jews and the slavery of Negroes; and

Whereas in consonance with the policy of the United States it is both proper and fitting to advance the aspirations for freedom and independence of all nations by honoring their historic advocates of human liberty, and thus forging indissoluble spiritual ties with the respective peoples; and

Whereas by all evidence a Freedom stamp series can become an important and essential vehicle of expression in the formation and strengthening of such ties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is requested and authorized to create and initiate a Captive Nations Freedom Series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom. The first of this series shall be designated as the Taras Shevchenko Freedom Stamp, symbolizing the determined struggle of his Ukraine, the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe, for national freedom and independence. Within the selected format of the series, such stamps shall be of such denomination and design and shall be issued for such period commencing in 1965 as the Postmaster General shall determine.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine.

Ever since the Mongol conquest of the Kiev State in the 13th century, the Ukraine has always lived under alien rule. It has also been the battleground of east Europe. Its natural riches attract all neighbors and its sparsely wooded steppes provide easy routes for invasions.

In March 1917, the czarist Government of Russia was overthrown and succeeded by the weak interregal government of Prince Lvov. In April of that year, a Rada—assembly—convened in the old Ukrainian capital of Kiev and established a Ukrainian Government.

On November 7, 1917, the assumption of power in Petrograd by the Bolsheviks, led by Nikolai Lenin, completely changed the situation. In accordance with the Bolshevik declaration that any part of the former Russian Empire could secede, the Rada declared the Ukraine to be an independent republic on January 22, 1918.

Unfortunately, the Ukrainian Republic was shortlived. By 1921 the country was overrun by the Russian Communists and the Ukraine again became a subjugated nation. It was one of the first and earliest victims of Soviet imperialism and has paid a tremendous toll in suffering and destruction. The Ukraine's national churches were destroyed, the country suffered terrible famines, mass murders, purges, and deportations. Nevertheless, the spiritual and moral resources of the Ukrainian people have not been exterminated, nor has its indomitable desire for national freedom been extinguished after all these years of enslavement and suffering.

The Ukrainian nation numbers some 44 million people and constitutes the largest non-Russian group behind the Iron Curtain in Europe. In the struggle of the free world against communism, the Ukrainians are a most important and potential ally of the Western democracies. They have survived through five centuries of Tartar barbarism. Never have they stopped their struggle for the liberation of their country from the Communist yoke.

Their cause is a righteous one. They merit our support and encouragement.

On the occasion of the 47th anniversary of their independence, we share in the aspirations of Ukrainians everywhere for the early liberation of their country. We extend our greetings and renew our wishes to all Americans of Ukraine descent that their country of origin, the Ukraine, will soon regain its independence from the forces of evil and tyranny which are in control today.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago a band of brave and patriotic Ukrainians unfurled the banner of freedom and proclaimed Ukraine's political independence. That event marked the realization of a long-cherished national dream. Then, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Republic was born. But soon after its birth the newborn Republic was faced with innumerable difficult problems, and the most pressing of these was the crucial problem of national security. Even before the Ukrainian Republic had any chance to cope effectively with any of its problems, the country was under attack first by the Poles from the north, and 2 years later by the powerful Red army of Communist Russia. As the Ukrainians by themselves alone could not have coped with the deadly onslaught of the Soviet Union's might, their independence was doomed. Their forced surrender in the fall of 1920 brought to a close a short but brilliant chapter in their recent history.

Today Ukraine is the second largest Socialist Republic in the Soviet Union, second only in size and in population to the Russian Socialist Republic itself. And some 44-million-odd Ukrainians constitute about a fifth of the Soviet

Union's total population. Bearing these impressive facts in mind, it is truly tragic to think that so many millions of Ukrainians, constituting such an important segment of the European community, and possessing distinct national traits, do not enjoy today any of the elemental privileges and amenities of life which are considered natural birthrights of all human beings. If these Ukrainians were allowed some freedom, and if they were in a position to realize part of their national aspirations, they would have established a democratic government based upon those freedoms necessary for their full cultural, intellectual, and spiritual development. Unfortunately such has not been their unhappy lot. For more than four decades conditions have been far from normal in the Ukraine, and the people there have been fated to suffer under the detested Communist totalitarian tyranny.

For long periods in their modern history Ukrainians have lived under conditions not at all conducive to the wholesome development of their political, intellectual, social, cultural, and economic life. For a long time they have been denied the attainment of their supreme national goal: that of determining the form of their national political life. The geography of their country, and modern international politics have largely determined the course of their history. Though older than modern Russia, more than three centuries ago they fell under the unrelenting domination of Russian czars. Until the rise of the Communist Russian regime they had no choice but make the best of a bad situation. Since the advent of communism in Russia, and the forcible incorporation of their country into the Soviet Union, tragedy has been their lot.

For more than four decades the Kremlin's agents have ruled the Ukraine with an iron hand. They have practically sealed off the country from the free world, and there has been no trace of freedom there. The minions of the Kremlin have seen to it that there be no Western "trappings," such as freedom and independent action in the country. In such total darkness and depression, in total misery and endless suffering, there is one indestructible element of encouragement. That is the Ukrainian's innate and inborn desire for freedom and independence, his unquenchable yearning for liberty. Fortunately neither the tyrants of Moscow, nor their servants in the Ukraine, can extinguish this spirit which all Ukrainians claim as their birthright. As long as that noble spirit is kept alive, as long as the ideal of national freedom is cherished by them, no dictatorship or Communist tyranny can rob them of their real independence: the independence of their soul and hearts. On the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day I wish them fortitude and forbearance.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, January 22, Americans of Ukrainian descent in my State of North Dakota, as well as Ukrainians the world over, observed the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence for the Ukrainian National Republic.

Freedom and independence, following centuries of foreign domination, were cherished by the Ukrainian people, but were short lived. Soviet Russia launched an attack against the new nation, which struggled valiantly against numerically superior forces for 3½ years.

While Ukrainians have been under Communist domination since 1920, they have never surrendered the spirit of freedom. As stated by Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, of Steele, N. Dak., president of the North Dakota State branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.:

Ukrainians all over the world will celebrate this day as a memorial to the once-free Ukraine, while Ukrainians in America will set aside this date to reassert their belief in freedom for all people and to reaffirm their conviction that tyranny and despotism cannot long prevail where men so believe.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay my tribute to the Ukrainian people for their steadfast courage and dedication to the principle that human beings can best reach their highest potential under conditions of freedom.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago, on January 22, 1918, a manifesto was issued by the Ukrainian Central Rada—Parliament—declaring the Ukraine to be an independent, free, and sovereign state of Ukrainian people. On this anniversary of their struggle for independence from all forms of foreign oppression, we want to once again express our hope that this desire for freedom and justice will be fulfilled.

After centuries of struggle against the autocracy of the Russian czars, the unquenchable thirst of the Ukrainian people to govern themselves in a spirit of freedom and independence seemed to have been satisfied. Tragically, after 2 short years, a new form of Russian despotism—godless communism—crushed their independence with overwhelming military power.

Since that time, over 40 million Ukrainians, both behind the Iron Curtain and in our own country, have dreamed of the day when the independence for which they have strived so earnestly will once again be restored. It has been shown that the desire of a people to be free from tyranny cannot forever be stilled. By observing Ukrainian Independence Day, we demonstrate our recognition and approval of this historical fact.

At the same time that we reaffirm our belief in the principle of national self-determination, we remind the Soviet leaders that we have not and cannot forget their suppression of the rights and freedoms of other peoples. For ourselves, we recall that freedom has always been a precious and fragile possession, and those gallant Ukrainians who fought to retain theirs provide us with a moving example of its value, and a poignant lesson for our own future.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian nation. It is fitting that Congress recognize that historic date in the annals of an ancient nation now submerged by the new imperialism of Rus-

sian communism. This occasion provides us with an opportunity to pay tribute to all those who have sacrificed and struggled over a span of many decades to keep alive the spirit of Ukrainian national independence. By these means we reaffirm our dedication to the political ideals and aspirations which are the foundation of our own national independence and our hope for all the nations of the world.

No people in modern history have fought harder or longer for their national independence. The Ukrainian proclamation of January 22, 1918, which we recall today, culminated a long struggle to break free of the Russian empire. We are reminded again today that Ukrainian national independence fell before the armed aggression of Russian communism after 3 years of war and great human sacrifice by the Ukrainian people. But the Russian occupation of Ukraine did not end the determination of her people to win freedom and independence. That determination is as strong today and in some ways stronger than it was 47 years ago.

It is a tribute to the spirit and character of the people of Ukraine that today, after more than 40 years of ruthless oppression and exploitation by the new imperialism of Moscow, their aspirations for freedom and self-government are unbroken and undimmed. The strength and depth of that spirit can be measured best against the record of efforts made by Moscow to break it. Those efforts include a manmade famine which took the lives of millions of Ukrainians, mass deportations, persecution of the intellectual and educated classes, cultural and spiritual genocide. Such storms of Communist tyranny have been broken on the Gibraltar of courage which has characterized life in modern day Ukraine.

There are encouraging signs that the Communist empire over which Moscow presides is faced with political and economic problems for which tyranny and despotism have no answers. The tide of change is flowing throughout the last remaining empire on earth. Promises of a better life made by the new ruling group are not being supported by genuine changes in the instruments of state control which are responsible for the crisis. Invoking the reactionary theories of Marxism-Leninism has become nothing more than a temporary escape mechanism for the new rulers of the empire, who are themselves enslaved by chains of the past. Time will tell whether the new Russian rulers have set themselves on a collision course with progress and the demands of their colonies for a full share in the political and economic life of modern civilization.

President Johnson in his state of the Union address made reference to the "restless nations" of central-east Europe. These are, of course, the captive nations under imperial control of Moscow. There can be little doubt about the restless character of all the captive nations or that their restlessness arises from a rejection of colonial status in this era of anticolonialism. How should we respond to this opportunity? That ques-

tion has posed a great national issue for many years. There is no single or simple answer to that question and the issue it poses is as complex as the quest for peace with freedom.

As we face this issue in the months and years ahead, it would be well to reflect upon the guidelines laid down by President Johnson in his inaugural address. In stating our national purposes in world affairs he said:

We aspire to nothing that belongs to others. We seek no dominion over our fellow man, but man's dominion over tyranny and misery.

Man's dominion over tyranny is a goal toward which all of us must work in a world where the tyranny of man over his fellow men has for too long thwarted peace and threatened war. It is in the highest American tradition that we should turn our full national energies to this task. President Johnson also reminds us in this connection:

The American covenant called on us to help show the way for the liberation of man. That is still our goal. Thus, if as a nation there is much outside our control, as a people no stranger is outside our hope.

As we observe this anniversary of Ukrainian national independence, we embrace the hopes of that submerged nation as our own. We view the restless yearnings of the people of Ukraine as evidence there is much to be done before we achieve man's dominion over tyranny. We are comforted in the knowledge that bridges of the spirit which bind us together in common cause shall serve to help us show the way for the liberation of man.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago, after centuries of domination and harassment by foreign rulers, the people of the Ukraine at last overcame their alien oppressors and acclaimed their independence. The hopes that sprang up in the hearts of those brave people when at last they were free can be fully appreciated only by those who also have been the victims of subjection. We, to whom freedom has long been an unquestioned way of life, can but faintly understand what the achievement of independence meant to them after centuries of yearning and striving for it.

A new life was opening for them to live in the fulfillment of their aspirations. But in 2 years, tragedy, in the form of the ruthless Red revolution, struck again and snatched from them their briefly tasted freedom. The oppressive Soviet domination has continued over those freedom-loving people of the Ukraine ever since that time, without any promise of restoring them to their rightful place in the community of nations.

More than 40 million Ukrainians are the victims of Soviet domination. These people are afforded no opportunity to commemorate the anniversary of the winning of their long-sought freedom. Only we, who live in freedom and independence, can mark that day for them. We can express our concern over their present plight. We can express our hope that once again they and all the oppressed people throughout the world

will soon be the masters of their own destiny.

The captive people of the Ukraine—numbering one-fourth the entire population of the United States—must know that they are not forgotten. The aspirations they had in 1918 must be kept alive in their hearts by the knowledge that millions of Americans are conscious of their tragic plight and earnestly pray that it will soon be relieved. The efficacy of prayer may be completely unknown to the atheistic rulers, but the religious people of the Ukraine will be sustained by their own prayers and those of Americans until their freedom is once more attained.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, 44 million Ukrainians constitute the second largest Slavic group in the huge landmass of the Slavic world extending from Eastern Europe to the Pacific Ocean. But these valiant and dauntless fighters for their freedom have not been successful in staving off fundamental threats to their national existence by the Russians. That is why, since the middle of the 17th century, they have been compelled to endure the oppressive yoke of czarist Russia and then the almost unbearable yoke of Communist Russia. But there was a short and happy interlude of about 2 years, in 1918–20, when they seemed masters of their fate and captains of their national soul.

As the result of the Russian revolution and the defeat of imperial Austria in the First World War, the autocratic forces which had been holding down the Ukrainians were overthrown, and so the Ukraine had the golden opportunity of asserting its freedom. On January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence. The democratic government constituted in the new Ukrainian Republic did its utmost to cope with the new state's difficult problems, but it had neither the manpower nor the resources to cope with these effectively. In the meantime, the Ukraine's inveterate and deadly foe, now in Communist garb, was preparing for the kill. Before the Ukrainian Republic could muster sufficient forces with which to stave off impending threats to its existence, it was attacked by the Red army in 1920. The country was overrun, and by the fall of that year became part of the Soviet Union. Thus ended the brief 2-year period of independent existence for the Ukrainian people.

Since those fateful days the whole world has been radically transformed in many respects, but unfortunately the Communist yoke imposed upon the Ukrainian people by the men in the Kremlin has not changed. The Communist Russians are as much masters of Ukraine today, and more firmly entrenched there, than they were in the 1920's. On the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day we pray for the relaxation of Communist tyranny in Ukraine and for the eventual freedom of the Ukrainian people.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, hard-working, liberty-loving, and supremely devout Ukrainians have struggled for their freedom against terrible odds for centuries. In 1918, when the forces that

held them in chains were shattered, they proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian Republic. From its birth on January 22 until its agonizing death at the hands of the Russians 2 years later, the newborn state was faced with insurmountable difficulties and implacable enemies. The Communists were the deadliest and the most ferocious among these. Early in 1920 the country was attacked and eventually overrun by the Red army. Soon it was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and the independent Ukraine had ceased to exist.

Since those fateful days more than 44 million Ukrainians have borne the heavy yoke of the Kremlin and have suffered in ways beyond description. They have been robbed of their worldly possessions, and they have been put to death by the millions. They were driven from their homes to the forbidding vastnesses of Siberian wasteland and in slave-labor camps they were forced to work for their heartless taskmasters in the Kremlin under most abominable conditions.

The Ukrainians are still imprisoned in their homeland and still suffering under the relentless Communist totalitarian tyranny. On the 47th anniversary celebration of their independence day I fervently hope and pray for their delivery from tyranny.

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to participate in this commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

In addition to my personal devotion to the cause of freedom, I speak out, also, today, in behalf of all of the people of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois and particularly those fine citizens of Ukrainian birth and descent who have contributed so much to the economic, spiritual, and cultural life of my district and of the Nation.

No aspect of the growth and spread of communism is more disheartening than that experienced by the Ukrainian nation and others in the Communist orbit who are held in the grasp of this atheistic society.

There are signs in the air indicating that the cause of human freedom is on the march in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. It is the fervent hope of all Americans, I am sure, that the Ukrainian nation may soon regain its independence and freedom, and that the great laughter, song, music, dancing, and literature of this historic nation may rebound with new vigor and energy to the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, and Americans of Ukrainian descent in celebrating the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day and in paying tribute to the freedom-loving people of the largest captive non-Russian nation in Europe.

The dedication of the Ukrainian people to the principles of freedom and dignity of the individual has been a shining example to the world. Congress is today commemorating the 47th anniversary of the declaration of the Ukrainian National Republic. Although

free Ukraine survived for only 2 years until it lost its hard-won independence to Communist tyranny, the spirit and determination of the Ukrainian people has survived intact.

To those of us who are free, the flame of Ukrainian liberty should renew our desire to maintain and strengthen the cause of freedom everywhere.

It is a pleasure to join my colleagues in commemorating the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day and to assure the captive people of that country that we in America join in their prayers and hopes that freedom will again grace their land and they will be given the opportunity for a free and just form of government.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in an observance of the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

We, in the U.S. Congress, welcome this opportunity to pay tribute to a great people and to express hope that they will achieve once more a life of freedom. Year after year we have passed a resolution commemorating Captive Nations Week. In so doing, Congress and the American people have demonstrated their support of the eternal principle of self-determination.

Many Americans are unaware of the fact that the U.S.S.R. is a multinational state consisting of ethnic groups variously estimated from 177 to more than 200. One hundred and twenty-five languages and dialects are spoken, and 40 different religions practiced in this nation which includes Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Armenians, Jews, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Tatars, Uzbeks, and many others—all individual ethnic groups with separate historical, cultural, political, religious, and social traditions and institutions. Indeed, there are more Turks in the Soviet Union than in Turkey; and more Moslems than in the United Arab Republic.

To achieve proper recognition of these groups, the Soviet Union should strive to become a melting pot of nationalities instead of a forced union of peoples who resist casting in the Soviet mold. Accordingly, we are constrained to point out to the world the profound contradiction that exists in the Soviet Union; namely, that while the Soviets attack the West on charges of colonialism and imperialism, their own country, the U.S.S.R., has in reality, through satellite control, the greatest of all colonial and imperial systems presently existing.

Few occasions during the year are more appropriate for pinpointing this contradiction than the one today, the commemoration of Ukrainian independence. The Ukrainian people have been the victims of Bolshevik oppression. Decades ago they demonstrated their desire to be free, yet freedom is denied them. They have suffered severest hardships under Soviet rule; deportations, forced famines, and religious persecution.

On this anniversary of Ukrainian independence, therefore, I join with all other Members of this legislative body to hail a people noble in their aspirations but, above all, noble in themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today we are honoring all Ukrainians in America by celebrating the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

The Ukrainian people historically have set an example for all nations to never cease in the fight for freedom and self-government. For centuries their country has been the victim of overpowering neighbor nations with conquering armies but the heroic Ukrainian people have constantly resisted and fought for their liberty and independence.

In 1918 the Ukrainian people finally won the victory which they had sought over the centuries and they overthrew their oppressors. Their nation, unfortunately, was the victim of Communist invasion and they have been under the tyranny of Soviet colonization to this day. The thirst for freedom of the Ukrainian people has never wavered and the spirit of resistance today is as strong as in generations past.

In observing this 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, I am again filing a resolution setting out the support of our Government by authorizing a special congressional committee to investigate the continued enslavement of Ukraine and all captive nations. I am asking that the Congress establish a special House committee to again remind the people of our Nation as well as the people of all nations, who love freedom, that the fight for human liberty must not cease until nations now under Communist tyranny be liberated.

In the 81st Congress I had the honor to be the chairman of the special Katyn Forest Congressional Investigating Committee which held hearings in this country and Europe exposing the Communist barbaric methods in their campaign of enslavement, when they massacred over 14,000 Polish leaders at the beginning of World War II. The publicity and exposure of Communist methods and tyranny was brought to the attention of the people of all the world during those hearings. The Soviet propaganda machine was placed on the defensive at that time and millions throughout the globe were reawakened to the threat of the Communist takeover.

The 42 million Ukrainians who are now virtually prisoners in their homeland are to be commended for continuing this fight for freedom by annually celebrating their own national holiday of independence.

If the nations of the free world continue their support, some day Ukraine and other captive nations will enjoy freedom, liberty, and self-government.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we commemorate the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation held captive behind the Iron Curtain. I am especially pleased to participate in this observance today under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

The people of the Ukraine fought valiantly but unsuccessfully against the Communist forces to retain their newly won freedom and their democratic government, but they were subjugated in 1920.

This was particularly tragic because the Ukrainian people had suffered through so many years of war and conquest before finally achieving their freedom, which was proclaimed on January 22, 1918. Their country had been divided under alien rulers for many years, but their short-lived unity and independence were cruelly taken from them by the Communist invaders.

Nevertheless, their desire for freedom remains strong and should be kept alive by every means possible until they are able to throw off the rule of their Communist oppressors. We who enjoy our freedom must never let the Ukrainian people think they have been forgotten by the free world.

The great longing of the Ukrainian people for freedom is manifested in the free world by the spirited activity of Ukrainian leaders, such as the great demonstration we witnessed in Washington last June when the Taras Shevchenko statue was dedicated.

One of the ways we in Congress could work for the best interests of the people of the Ukraine is by establishing a special House Committee on Captive Nations. On the opening day of this session I again introduced a resolution for this purpose and certainly hope that prompt and favorable consideration will be given to this proposal.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that true peace and freedom for the entire world will never be achieved until the people of the Ukraine and the other captives behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are permitted to develop under a government of their own choosing.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian people. For centuries these brave and dedicated patriots have suffered in the grip of Russian imperialism. They have endured the most tragic event in their history when forced to relinquish their freedom and political sovereignty only 2 short years after the founding of the Ukrainian Republic in 1918. This nation, encompassing 45 million people within its borders, is a captive of the Kremlin. The Ukrainian peoples died by the thousands in valiant efforts to preserve their independence and their unique national character. The Taras Shevchenko Monument stands as a daily reminder to us that this contemporary of Lincoln fought for the cause of freedom through his immortal works of art and literature. This patriot provided the inspiration for Ukrainian nationalism in his times and his words today intertwine the strands of patriotism that bind this freedom-repressed nation together.

Ukrainian history reveals an undying devotion to the ideals of freedom and independence. For a people who have known so few years of independence—from 1918-20—one might be prone to think that their love for freedom is slowly dying. On the contrary, the Ukrainian desire to be free permeates every daily act for constantly they are brought to grips with the crushing reality of living under a totalitarian system of government.

Here in the United States we are fortunate to have Americans of Ukrainian

descent defending our democratic way of life. These stouthearted people have been a positive force in the building of our democratic institutions, and they have always been ready to fight and die for the preservation of freedom. In this country they are known for their industry, ingenuity, and tenacity for hard work in any vocation; this is the backbone of their national character and the reason why their long history of nationalism is unparalleled.

The 45 million Ukrainians existing with the Communist bloc must not be forgotten; we must ever bear in mind the plight of these people who have seen their freedom destroyed by brutal force. They, as indeed all enslaved peoples, must always have our sympathies.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1965, will mark the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic. A great many Ukrainians have settled in North Dakota. Many of them are among our outstanding farmers, some have served in our State legislature, and others are professional men. We are very proud of the contributions they have made to our State. I wish to insert in the RECORD the letter I received from Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the North Dakota State Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. I also wish to include a press release issued by the North Dakota committee on this occasion. It is our great hope the Ukrainian people will soon have their freedom and independence which we in America all cherish.

The letter and press release follow:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC., STATE BRANCH
OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 10, 1965.

Hon. MARK ANDREWS,
U.S. Congressman, New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDREWS: Our sincere congratulations on your reelection to Congress. We assure you of our support in your work for the progress of America in the role of leader of the Western World in your endeavors for the common good of the peoples enslaved by the Communist tyranny.

January 22, 1965, will mark the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic. Ukrainians all over the world will celebrate this day as a memorial to the once-free Ukraine, while Ukrainians in America will set aside this date to reassert their belief in freedom for all people and to reaffirm their conviction that tyranny and despotism cannot long prevail where men so believe.

The Ukrainian democratic Republic was recognized by the Soviet Union, but not for long. Turmoil and chaos came when Communist Russia invaded the Ukrainian state despite its previous pledges to respect and honor the Ukrainians independence. By the end of 1920, this gallant struggle of the Ukrainian people came to a tragic end, when the Communists subjected it to the rule of the Bolshevik government. Despite the Communist yoke imposed by Moscow on Ukraine, the Ukrainian people never accepted the foreign domination but continued to struggle for their freedom.

The U.S. Congress and the President have recognized the legitimate right and aspiration of the Ukrainian people to freedom and national independence by enacting and signing respectively the Captive Nations Week Resolution in July 1959, which enu-

merated Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved and dominated by Communist Russia, and entitled to recognition and moral support on the part of the American people and the free world at large.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in North Dakota are planning to observe the forthcoming 47th anniversary as "Ukrainian Day" in a fitting and solemn manner. We firmly believe that you, Congressman ANDREWS, are fully aware of the importance of Ukraine as our ally in the common struggle against Russian totalitarian tyranny and in the defense of freedom.

The entire world, including the enslaved Ukrainian people, is looking toward the United States of America as the true citadel of freedom and hope for the oppressed people everywhere.

To observe this day provides an appropriate occasion for the American people and the U.S. Government to demonstrate their sympathy with understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian people, and to call on all our citizens, regardless of their national background to observe this day in recognition of the gallant struggle of the Ukrainian people for the most precious goal cherished by our own Nation and liberty loving people everywhere; freedom.

We are sure that you understand the significance of this day of Ukrainian independence anniversary and will read your message into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in commemoration of this event and thus contribute to the successful recognition of the anniversary.

Respectfully yours,

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA,
State Branch of North Dakota.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

On January 22, 1965, Americans of Ukrainian descent in our State will observe the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Ukraine, which occurred on January 22, 1918, in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine. This was the culmination of the centuries long aspiration of the Ukrainian people. After two and a half centuries of foreign oppression and domination, Ukraine regained its freedom and national independence. The sovereignty and independence of Ukraine was recognized by a number of states, including the Government of Soviet Russia. However, the Russian Government, led by Lenin and Trotsky at that time, launched a military aggression against the free Ukrainian state, despite previous pledges to honor and respect Ukrainian independence. After almost 3½ years of heroic and unequal struggle, the Ukrainian people deprived of all military, economic and diplomatic assistance on the part of the Western Powers, succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Soviet Russia.

Since 1920 Ukraine has remained under the Communist and totalitarian yoke of Moscow, but it never has surrendered the spirit of freedom, nor has it given up the hope for regaining its full freedom and national independence. In the past 46 years the Ukrainians have amply demonstrated their love for freedom by the unceasing uprisings and large-scale resistance movements, such as the underground resistance warfare waged by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) against both the Nazis and the Bolsheviks. The Ukrainians paid a high price in the defense of freedom and independence, as they were ruthlessly persecuted by Moscow through a series of inhuman measures undertaken by Kremlin, such as mass trials of Ukrainian patriots, mass deportations of Ukrainians to Siberia, and the systematic genocide of the Ukrainian people. Khrushchev, the deposed Communist dictator, stated himself at the 20th Congress of the

Communist Party in 1956 that Stalin planned the total annihilation of the Ukrainian people for their resistance to Russian communism.

Today, in January 1965, the Ukrainian people in enslaved Ukraine are continuing to fight for their freedom and national independence. They wage a stubborn and ceaseless struggle by passive resistance, economic sabotage and unrelentless opposition to the Russian alien rule imposed on Ukraine.

The U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by enacting and signing respectively the Captive Nations Week Resolution, which listed Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia and entitled to full freedom and national independence.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our State are planning to observe this memorable event—the 47th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence—with appropriate ceremonies and observances. Last June Americans of Ukrainian descent performed an outstanding feat by erecting a statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., in honor of the 150th anniversary of the birth of the Ukraine's national poet and Europe's freedom fighter—100,000 Ukrainians participated in this event. A number of our Congressmen and Senators are now seeking to issue a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko and to establish a section in the Congressional Library in recognition of this great man and freedom fighter.

On this day of the Ukraine's independence anniversary we should rededicate our efforts and our thoughts to the principle of freedom not only of the people of these countries, but for the freedom of all people in the world.

The struggle of the Ukrainian people is a gallant example of human courage and dedication. Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev had been the most despotic oppressors of the Ukrainian people, and the new masters, Brezhnev and Kosygin, are the same oppressors and enemies of freedom as were their predecessors.

In honoring the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence we are upholding the right of all people to the God-given right to freedom and national self-determination. These are the basic tenets and principles on which our own great Republic has been erected.

The principle of freedom is indivisible. Therefore, we honor the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, because we believe that the Ukrainian people and all other people enslaved by Communist Russia are entitled to the same fundamental rights as we so blessedly enjoy: freedom and independence.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainians today live under the Soviet domination, unable to enjoy the basic and fundamental rights of liberty, sovereignty, and freedom of speech. On the 47th anniversary of their national independence day, they cannot celebrate their onetime political freedom. It is for us to do so.

The history of the Ukrainian people has indeed been one of struggle for freedom against overwhelming odds leaving misery and hardship for the majority of its patriots in its wake. Since the day the liberty-loving Ukrainians signed a compact between the Russian czar and their leaders in 1654, they have only known brief periods of political independence—their longest lasting only 2 years, from 1918 to 1920. Their fate has been largely due to curious twists of international events and the Russian desire

for power. Yet despite the severe hardships, the Ukrainians have nourished their desire to be free; they did not submit docilely to the harsh rule of alien despots. Indeed the numerous persecutions against them only united them more closely together. Toward the end of the First World War, the Ukrainians finally proclaimed their independence on January 22, 1918, and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

That day marks one of the brightest yet tragic spots in the Ukrainian history for not only is it the day in which the years of struggle and deprivation of freedom came to an end, but it also serves as a vivid reminder of the freedom which was lost. For in early 1920, the Red army invaded and occupied the eastern part of the country, quickly crushing the Ukrainian opposition and forcing the native peoples to comply to Russian demands. At that fateful time, Ukraine again became a Russian colony. Yet, the flame of freedom flickers in the hearts of the Ukrainians, and for this very reason they endure the countless measures designed to subjugate them physically and in both mind and spirit. The Soviets cannot chalk up total victory so long as the Ukrainian peoples retain their national identity and their indomitable spirit for freedom.

The United States is fortunate to have many of the Ukrainians that were able to escape from the Soviet yoke; these Americans of Ukrainian descent have contributed to the free and democratic way of life; they have risked their lives to preserve the institutions which did not have a chance to flower in their homeland.

We Americans often overlook the fact that we enjoy our freedom every day in our lives; but freedom is not merely a hollow-sounding word. The Ukrainians, living under Soviet tyranny today, know what it means to lose their independence, yet their sturdy spirit and love for freedom is the only thing that sustains them.

We Americans salute the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the free and independent Ukrainian National Republic. Today, we, in this U.S. House of Representatives, commemorate an occasion significant to the people of the Ukraine and equally significant to the millions throughout the world who are dedicated to the cause of freedom. It is fitting that we pay tribute not only to the anniversary but to the men and women of courage who on January 22, 1918, regained their liberty and national independence following over a century of subjugation.

The centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history. This determined will for national freedom clearly crystallized itself in the old Ukrainian Kievan state from the 9th to the 14th century, in the Ukrainian Kozak state from 1648 to 1783, and more recently in the Ukrainian National Republic from 1917 to 1920. As one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism,

Ukraine, since the very inception of alien Bolshevik tyranny, has proved to be the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union. The destruction of its national churches, the horrible manmade famine of 1932-33, the mass murder at Vinnitsia in 1937-39, and the vast purges and deportations decreed by Moscow have failed to exterminate the spiritual and moral resources for national freedom in Ukraine. The historic capital of Kiev, with centuries of rich tradition and culture conserved in its vaults, still symbolizes today the indestructible hope and passion of a nation destined to be sovereign, free, and independent.

During the Second World War millions of Ukrainian patriots seized the short-lived opportunity of the German invasion to realize once again this hope, only to be frustrated in their valiant efforts by the scourge of another imperialism. But this unbending will shall continue to be strong and powerful in the epic struggle of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army—UPA—against the evil forces of Soviet imperialism, and in the resistance of the Ukrainian people.

As a nation of over 43 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—the Ukraine stands as one of the most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the free Europe of tomorrow must be assured, if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be invincible.

We are all fully aware of the importance of the Ukraine as an ally in the common struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. On this 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, let us rededicate ourselves to the restoration of liberty and self-determination to all who now suffer behind the Iron Curtain of Red tyranny.

We must extend a hand of friendship to the Ukrainian people and our moral support to their aspirations. We must also join them in prayer that their just cause will soon be realized.

Admiration alone for freedom fighters in the Ukraine and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain will not help these people to get rid of Russian domination. We must do more than that if we still believe in the principle that all nations, however great, however small, should be free and independent.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it was 47 years ago when the stouthearted and brave people of Ukraine proclaimed to the world its independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic. Unfortunately, its freedom was only of a temporary nature, for in 1920 that land was overrun by the Red army and was forced to become a satellite of the Russians.

You may properly ask, why should we here in the United States and particularly here in the Congress mark this occasion? In reply I state that we do so for three very good reasons:

First. Because we Americans who treasure liberty and democracy are

deeply touched by the plight of 42 million Ukrainians, the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe and of enslaved peoples everywhere.

Second. For the reason that we personally know countless Ukrainians and people of Ukrainian ancestry who have become good loyal U.S. citizens and who have contributed so very much to America.

Third. By our taking official cognizance of a valiant beginning of a nation which shook off the shackles of its overlords much in the same manner as our Original Thirteen Colonies did in 1776, we give notice to all the world of our sympathy and encouragement to captive nations everywhere to persevere in their fight for independence.

Before I alluded to the fact that we all know those Ukrainians who not only make the United States their home and their new country and have thereby enriched our culture with their special aptitudes and became an important factor in making America the great Nation it is, but they are also now numbered among our valued American citizens of whom we are justly proud and happy to have among us.

The late John F. Kennedy in his book, "A Nation of Immigrants," which is a compelling story of America's origins and development, quotes Oscar Handlin as follows:

Once I thought to write a history of immigrants in America. Then I discovered that immigrants were American history.

In that spirit our late President's great book is a history of America. It is the exciting story of the 42 million immigrants who have come to our shores since our beginnings as a nation.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, in his recent letter to me respecting the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine mentions the President's state of the Union message, in which President Johnson declared:

With the Soviet Union we seek peaceful understandings that can lessen the danger to freedom.

I should now like to quote another sentence in that message of the President to the effect that "In this period no new nation has become Communist, and the unity of the Communist empire has begun to crumble." This augurs well for the future of Ukraine and all the captive nations. By the work of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., hope for the future freedom of that land will be kept alive in the hearts of all people. I trust that someday Ukraine will join the community of free and independent nations in the world.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join my colleagues today in marking the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence.

No people within the Soviet empire have suffered more, suffered longer, and resisted harder than the people of the Ukraine. There should be no illusion about the great difficulty faced by the forces of freedom in that area. Unlike the captive nations farther to the west, Ukrainians are more deeply involved in the Soviet way of life, and face greater

obstacles in the assertion of nationalist spirit.

Our participation in this observance is not an empty gesture. By our action, the greatest deliberative body in the world reaffirms the principle of self-determination and alerts people everywhere to the colonial aspects of the Soviet Union. Let it not be forgotten that 45 percent of the Soviet Union is composed of non-Russians.

There are powerful social, economic, and political forces at work in Eastern Europe. All are infected by the germ of freedom from the West—a germ which appeals to the basic Western orientation of most of the captive nations. From year to year, the internal situation of these captive nations has changed: at times toward greater flexibility, as in Rumania and Hungary in 1964, and at times in the direction of reaction, as in the atrophied Poland of today. What seems impossible today, may become possible in the future. Somebody must keep the faith, both within and without that unhappy area.

The culture, language, and religion of the Ukraine have been maintained despite decades of difficulties. History teaches us that their maintenance will form the basis for national emergence.

In our observance today, we are doing what is morally right, as well as what is politically right. In doing so, we serve the cause of freedom everywhere.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of my earliest boyhood recollections is that of the magic which the mere mention of the Ukraine evoked. At no time could my wandering attention be more completely recaptured by my no doubt despairing teacher than at those times when the nature and climate, the principle products, and the day-to-day life of Ukrainians were under discussion.

The pictures which came before me then were of golden fields of wheat, of pastures and barnyards where poultry, sheep, hogs, and dairy cattle led placid existences, the bountiful vineyards of the Crimea. I could even see the stalwart Ukrainian people tending their crops and their livestock, gathering the fruits of their vineyards, and earning their daily bread from the rich deposits of coal, iron, and other metals of their land.

But even then the pictures which took me out of the classroom and into the beauty and bounty of the Ukraine could only suggest a fraction of the natural gifts bestowed on this land—a land which by today's cold light of reality can only conjure up the horrible picture of starvation and oppression of this, the second largest nation under Soviet domination. The Golgotha of Ukrainians has indeed been brought about by the attempts of the Kremlin to blot out the brave resistance of the Ukrainian people to Soviet enslavement.

Into the greedy, power-seeking hands of the Kremlin despots now pours the wealth of the Ukraine—the products of the vast forests of the lowlands, the crops of the fertile black earth of the land to the east, the vast production of the mining and metallurgical industries, the electric power, and the vast assortment of products which come from the extensive

industrialization of the Ukraine which has been accomplished by the energy and ingenuity of the brave people of Ukraine.

As we observe here on January 25 the event of the independence of Ukraine, we should stop and consider the lesson to be drawn from the fact that this 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine did indeed take place on January 22 and that we are delayed in our tribute to the freedom-loving Ukrainian people because this great representative body paused in observance of the inauguration of our President—the great occasion when our Chief Executive raises his hand and commits himself to serve under our Constitution and in accordance with a Government established for the people, by the people, and of the people.

When we consider the vast wealth and power of our great country and the freedom which abounds for the people of America, how can we do less than to pledge ourselves anew to a leading role alongside the freedom-loving people of Ukraine and the other captive nations in their determination to restore their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We should not forget that those Ukraine-Americans who left their oppressed homeland to live among us have contributed much from their own rich tradition and faith to our deeply rooted principal of universal freedom. It is of special importance that we join with them in our common heritage and common future in peace and liberty.

We cannot say that this observance of that day in 1918, 47 years ago, when the independence of Ukraine was declared, is a joyous one—because now Ukrainian freedom is only a dream among those suffering human beings who live under the misery inflicted by Soviet domination. But we can make known to the world our determination as freedom-loving Americans of every ancestry to stand with the people of Ukraine and the other captive nations until the day when they are again free from cruelty and oppression. To this purpose we are dedicated, and until that great day comes we must not diminish our support of the hopes and dreams and the fight and struggle of these Soviet-dominated nations to rid themselves of their oppressors.

We salute our friends, the Ukrainians, in our resolve to strengthen their aspirations for freedom and independence from foreign rule and pledge to them our help.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, January 22 was Ukrainian Independence Day. In 1917, tens of millions of Russians subjected to the czarist regime cast aside the heavy yoke of that autocratic government and proclaimed their independence. To those peoples, the Russian Revolution of 1917 seemed to usher in a new day; they hoped to find their freedom in the overthrow of the czarist order.

At first their optimism seemed justified. By the end of World War I nearly all ethnic groups in that sprawling empire had attained, or at least proclaimed, their national independence. The Ukrainians were the most numerous of these nationality groups.

The Ukraine had been part of the Russian Empire since mid-17th century, and during that time attempts had been made to eradicate Ukrainian nationalism and national ideals. But these cruel efforts were unsuccessful. The liberty-loving Ukrainians clung firmly to their traditional national ideals, and in 1918 they regained their independence.

On January 22, 1918, they proclaimed the birth of the Ukrainian National Republic and set up their own democratic form of government. Unfortunately, however, the independent state thus born did not last long. For only 2 years the Ukrainians enjoyed their freedom, then they lost it to their inveterate foe, the Russian Communists. Early in the 1920's the country was overrun, for the Ukrainians could not by themselves stave off the superior force of the Red army. Their independent existence came to an end, and their country was annexed to the Soviet Union.

For over 40 years, Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainians have been captives under the unrelenting rule of the Kremlin. On the 47th anniversary celebration of their independence, it is fitting to recall that memorable event. These gifted and gallant people, who refused to be submerged in Russia's empire for centuries, today with equal determination refuse to be absorbed and amalgamated into the Soviet Union. Even under most trying circumstances, they have not given up their hope for freedom.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we have the right and duty once again to express our sympathy with the Eastern European peoples under domination of the Soviet Union. Not least of these are the people of the Ukraine, whose 47th anniversary of independence was observed on this January 22 just past.

In the savage wars that have drenched our century, the Ukrainians have suffered invasion and counterinvasion, burnings and destruction and death not surpassed in any place or in any generation.

In the breakup of the czarist state during World War I, they rose against eastern domination and helped hurl out the remnants of the collapsing czarist armies. Invaded almost instantly by troops of the German Empire, they suffered the imposition of a puppet king—but not for long, for they rose to hurl out the puppet. Invaded yet once more by the Red armies of Lenin's new state, they lost the sovereignty and nationhood they had twice sought to establish in those bitter years.

The Ukraine, as always, was a battlefield for the contests of armies in World War II. The Nazi hordes swept in and then were driven back in years of incredible struggle.

There is no doubt in the minds of those who know the Ukrainian people, the Ukrainian culture, that tens of millions still living in their homeland maintain a strong and burning desire for sovereignty and independence. Americans of Ukrainian descent have labored for decades to keep open the lines of communication, and they know well the feelings of Ukrainians in the land of their birth.

Freedom is still an indivisible element in man's affairs. The suppression of national sovereignty anywhere on the earth must be a cause of concern to those who believe in liberty.

It is fitting, therefore, for this House to renew its expressions of concern for the future liberation of the Ukraine from an alien domination imposed by a monolithic political state and imposed equally, by troops and tanks and guns. A captive people is a captive people—no matter how long enduring the tyranny imposed from without. We must pay our tribute to the Ukrainians and salute them and express our acknowledgement of their yearnings for independence.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1965, marked the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. We are free to commemorate this date in history, but, unfortunately, the people in the Ukraine do not have this privilege. The freedom gained by these brave people on January 22, 1918, was short-lived—only 2 years. The Red army invaded the Ukraine and took over.

These people who suffered so much to win their independence have been under Soviet domination for more than 40 years, but they have not given up the hope and will to be a free and independent nation. When we reflect upon the burning desire for freedom of these people, we cannot help but be reminded of our own desires and fight for independence. We were successful and pray that we will never fall under the heel of tyranny that has been the misfortune of the Ukraine.

The United States has never sought to subjugate a nation and we continue to espouse the firm belief that every nation has the right to determine for itself the form of government it wishes and to choose this government in free elections.

In joining in this commemoration of Ukrainian independence, I hope that we give encouragement to these enslaved freedom-loving people and that in the near future they may be free to celebrate this day in their nation's life as we are free to celebrate our own Fourth of July, our Independence Day.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1965, marks the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence. In 1918, the flame of independence and democracy flickered briefly in a Russia torn by the ravages of World War I. The Ukrainian People's Republic, centered in Kiev, proclaimed its independence from the Moscow revolutionary regime, already in the hands of the Bolsheviks. The new Republic was recognized by several nations, including Soviet Russia. However, the Soviet Union attacked the Ukraine and, after 3½ years of heroic struggle, the long-cherished freedom of the Ukrainians was drowned in blood.

The people of the Ukraine have throughout history been subjected to various forms of alien domination. Yet, Ukrainian nationalism has survived all forms of subjugation and today remains a potent threat to Moscow.

During the four decades of Russian Communist enslavement, the Ukrainian people never accepted the Communist yoke imposed by Moscow and have con-

tinued to wage an unequal struggle for their freedom and national independence. The Ukrainian people have demonstrated their love of freedom and their opposition to alien slavery and oppression through a series of bloody and heroic uprisings, active and passive resistance, and large-scale underground warfare against Communist Russia during World War II.

Under the circumstances, Ukrainians cannot hope to celebrate their national independence day in their own country, but the hope for freedom and independence remains in their hearts and souls.

I join with the thousands of Ukrainians who took refuge in our own country in expressing sympathy on this anniversary date. It is my fervent hope that the goals of freedom and independence for the Ukrainians will be achieved soon.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania and other colleagues in marking the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. It is a privilege to pay tribute to the liberty-loving people of the Ukraine, and I hope Americans everywhere will join in observance of this significant anniversary and pledge their support to the enslaved people of the Ukraine.

January 22 not only marked the anniversary, but also provided us with a poignant reminder that the threat to freedom of all peoples and independence of nations is a constant one. The Ukrainian people were among the first to suffer the fate that has befallen millions of others. We must not forget the plight of the people under Communist rule or take our own freedom for granted.

Since the middle of the 17th century, except for a brief 2-year period in 1918–20, unhappy Ukrainians have not known freedom in their fair and fertile homeland. Until the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917, they were oppressed by the Russian autocracy. Then on January 22, in 1918, they proclaimed their national independence, established their republic, and set to work for its preservation. Late in 1920 the Russians, appearing now as Communist tyrants, sent their Red army into Ukraine and the country was overrun and made a part of the Soviet Union.

Since then, for 47 years, Ukrainians have been suffering under the tyranny of Soviet dictatorship, but they have not given up their ideals and they still cherish their national goal—freedom and independence.

It is appropriate that many of us have reintroduced resolutions providing for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. A Captive Nations Committee would be invaluable in drawing attention to the plight of the people behind the Iron Curtain and renewing our efforts to free them from Soviet imperialism.

I would like to quote from a letter I received from the president of the Omaha, Nebr., branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America:

As you are well aware, the freedom of the Ukrainian nation was a short-lived one, as

it fell under the heels of Communist Russian imperialism and subjugation. Nonetheless, the Ukrainian people have never lost their aspirations for freedom and have been waging both active and passive campaigns against Communist oppression.

It is in this spirit that we salute the Ukrainian people and all other captive peoples, reiterating our solidarity with the cause of freedom everywhere.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on the 47th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Republic, we take this opportunity to pledge our support to these freedom-repressed people who have fought so hard for their independence yet saw it vanish before their eyes under the force of Soviet totalitarianism.

In the 300 some years of their modern history, more than 40 million Ukrainians have known only 2 years of blessed freedom in which they enjoyed the undeniable right of national political independence. Though their homeland has been ravaged by alien despots, the Ukrainians have kept alive their unquenchable love for freedom. The Taras Shevchenko monument erected last June here in Washington symbolizes the determination and courage of the entire Ukrainian people; his works and art deem him worthy of the title, "Champion of Liberty."

The Ukrainians have suffered misery and hardship. They have been forced to endure the most humiliating thrusts of tyranny. Their history has been one of futile struggle against the devouring Russian drive for power. Their land, with one of the world's richest areas of grain, cannot be used to the best advantage owing to the notorious failures of the Soviet agricultural system. For these failures, Ukrainians have suffered considerably.

We Americans enjoy the rights that these people have been forced to relinquish; we are able to exercise our freedoms without undue restraint. However, we must bear in mind that the Ukrainians desire freedom just as we did when we too were dominated by an imperial power. We sympathize with their cause and extend to them our hopes for a better national life.

Captive Nations Week, which is observed in this country in the second week of July, indicates the degree of our concern for those freedom-starved nations now forced to live under Soviet dictatorship. Commemoration of this week serves a vital function to nations such as the Ukraine, for it shows the solidarity and the determination of the American people in the cause of world freedom. We do not forget the relentless struggle of these millions of patriots for liberty and independence.

Today the Ukrainians cannot celebrate their national holiday for they are prisoners in their own homeland. But for those Ukrainians living in the free world, and particularly for those Americans of Ukrainian descent, we observe this day solemnly as our way of paying homage to a great people. With heartfelt wishes, I join the rest of Americans in the celebration of the national independence day of the Ukrainian people and may their deep love of freedom someday become a living reality.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today throughout the United States Americans and Ukrainians are celebrating the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. However, regrettably those Ukrainians living in their homeland have no holiday in which to commemorate the only bright spot in their history.

In the past 300 years of their history the Ukrainians have known only 2 years of independence, that between 1918 and 1920. Surrounded by powerful neighbors greedy for their fertile lands of wheat, the Ukrainians have known what it is to struggle, despite misery and hardship, for freedom. Their indomitable spirit has withstood tortures inconceivable for us to comprehend, yet that spirit burns more brightly now than ever before. Up to the middle of the 17th century the Ukrainians were able to survive the onslaught of the invading Asiatic hordes, but then in 1654 their leaders signed a treaty with the Russian czar designed to unite the two countries. However, the standard of treachery began to enter into the relations between the isolated, small Ukraine and the powerfully large Russia; this treaty in effect ended the independence the Ukrainians had enjoyed up to that time. From this date the Ukrainians were forced to abandon their national ideals of freedom and traditional beliefs. Ukraine became a colony of imperialist Russia. However, the Russians were unable to stamp out their growing nationalism, which has become a powerful living force especially among the Ukrainians today.

Only in 1918 did Ukrainian patriots succeed in realizing their centuries-old dream of independence. Yet fate was to deal them a crushing blow in 1920. The country was invaded and overrun by the Red army, and its new independence was shattered. Although that freedom was shortlived, the proclamation of Ukrainian independence and the establishment of their Republic came to symbolize the realization of the deepest and heartfelt Ukrainian ideal—freedom.

The Ukrainian people have suffered more under the Soviet tyranny than their forebears under Russia's autocratic czars. They have no freedom of expression or of movement, thus their leaders resort to underground tactics to show their defiance. Although information of their activities and victories is scanty, these leaders have kept the Ukrainian desire for independence burning brightly. Hostile acts of the Soviet dictators have been countered with rebellion and counterattack. For example, the Ukrainian political leaders, deported in vast numbers to the forced labor camps in Siberia, staged bloody rebellions that shook the Kremlin with its force in 1953, 1954, 1955, and again in 1956. When the Hungarian uprising took place, some Ukrainian freedom fighters came to their aid. Many gave their lives for the cause of freedom no matter how little chance they had to succeed against Soviet totalitarianism.

The spirit of these courageous freedom fighters is symbolized in the Taras Shevchenko monument erected here in Washington last June. This man in his

poems and songs has done more to unify the Ukrainians together in their common aspiration for independence than any other national hero. The awe-inspiring statue stands as daily witness to those who have put patriotism and freedom above life and material happiness.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as a bulwark of strength and courage against Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Our sympathies go out to these heroic people and on the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence we join with freedom-loving people throughout the globe in the celebration of their independence day in the fervent hope that someday they will enjoy the right of self-determination.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the voice of this House is being heard throughout the world in its commemoration of the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Ukraine from the bonds of Russian domination.

The days and hours of the closing months of World War I that saw the terror and anarchy of the decline and dissolution of empire also witnessed the brightness of the hopes of many small groups of peoples. They saw in their own hands the possibilities of self-government, of the end of dynasties in which they had not found a future.

The Ukrainian people, living in one of the finest territories of the world, were among these who worked hopefully to attain such government. Today, their proclamation of independence stands for the aspirations of some 45 million Ukrainian people—but they live in subjugation to an empire more rigorous than any the world has ever known.

These words express the feeling and earnest hope of the American people that the Ukrainians, once more, will find their way to freedom and to independence.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, once again it is my privilege to take part in commemorating the anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

Forty-seven years have passed since the people of the Ukraine proclaimed freedom and joined the community of sovereign nations. But communism never respects the sovereignty of others, and within 2 short years the legitimate aspirations of this nation were suppressed. The fact that Soviet tyranny has not destroyed the will of the Ukrainians to be free is a testimonial to the indomitable spirit of human beings for liberty.

Nevertheless, these proud people remain captives of international communism. As long as the regime remains Communist, the people of the Ukraine remain prisoners, for the survival of the Communist Party depends upon the Red army.

It is very important that the United States take every opportunity to expose Communist colonialism in every corner of the globe. As leaders of the free world we cannot afford to do less and still keep faith with our heritage. So on this occasion let us rededicate our-

selves to the restoration of liberty and self-determination for all who remain imprisoned behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday marked the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine and I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the great people of the Ukraine. The brave people of the Ukraine need this demonstration of our faith in those behind the Iron Curtain who wish to be free.

On January 22, 1918, when these people proclaimed their independence, it was the culmination of a centuries-old struggle by the Ukrainian people to achieve their freedom from Moscow, but their victory was short lived. The country was quickly taken over by the Bolshevik armies, and once more Ukraine became a captive nation.

Mr. Speaker, even in spite of deportations, imprisonment, religious persecution, labor camps, ruthless executions, and other Soviet repressive measures, the spirit of the people has not been broken and the hope of regaining their independence continues to burn brightly in their hearts.

I salute both the Ukrainian people and those Americans of Ukrainian descent whose deep love of freedom and deep commitment to American ideals has added so greatly to the progress of our great country. Therefore, it is not only my hope but also my conviction that the people of the Ukraine, like the people of the other nations who are now slaves to Communist imperialism, the nations we refer to as captive nations, will soon be free again.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this proclamation of independence lasted less than 3 years and since 1920 40 million Ukrainians have not been able to enjoy the benefits of a free and independent life in their historic homeland. Once again they are persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming of independence and freedom. But oppression and persecution has united the Ukrainians against their foes and held them together.

Therefore, on this 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, let us solemnly commemorate the continuing struggle for freedom of a brave and noble people.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today we, Americans, are beset by a serious crisis in Vietnam. With each passing day the crisis deepens. American lives have been lost. Americans have been seriously wounded. And yet, the Communist North Vietnamese continue to press on toward their asserted military and political goal of conquering all of Vietnam.

This type of confrontation of power is not a new phenomenon in the history of world communism. Indeed, the nation whose independence we commemorate today, the Ukraine, had such a battle for survival on its hands 45 years ago. Then, as now, the enemy was communism. Regrettably, the Ukrainians were not able to sustain the independence they had declared, and like many other former non-Russian peoples of the Russian

Empire who had declared their independence with the collapse of the Empire, the Ukrainians were conquered by the Bolsheviks and reincorporated into a new Russian empire, the Soviet empire.

In the years that followed, the Ukrainians had suffered much under the tyranny of communism. They had known the full weight of the harsh collectivization program that had brought catastrophe to their land and people. Political, economic, and cultural oppression had become a part of everyday Ukrainian life, but by the force of interior strength they were able to sustain their sense of national identity and resist whenever possible the Moscovite autocracy.

Will the Ukrainians, along with other Soviet peoples, ever have the right of self-determination?

This only history can tell, and for those of us in the free world we can only hope and pray that this right shall one day be theirs to exercise.

On this anniversary of Ukrainian independence, therefore, we take this opportunity to reassert our own faith in democratic principles, especially in this all-inclusive democratic principle of self-determination. On this occasion we should also take stock of our commitment to resist Communist aggression throughout the world.

Americans of Ukrainian extraction, the Ukrainian community of Hudson County, N.J., met this past Sunday, January 24, 1965, to celebrate the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. I was the guest speaker of honor, and I was happy to join these courageous people in their wish and will to further Ukrainians' right of self-determination. All freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, on this occasion, join in this wish.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last June 27, 1964, Washington witnessed a dramatic series of events, revolving about the unveiling of the statue of Taras Shevchenko, the great Ukrainian poet, whose immortal words inspired lovers of freedom 150 years ago and still keep alive in the hearts and minds of his countrymen the determination to continue with singleness of purpose on the road to freedom until the Ukraine is free.

On the occasion of the unveiling in Washington, the capital of the free world, 36,000 Ukrainians marched in parade and 100,000 witnessed the unveiling. A significant and inspiring symbol of the determination of the Ukrainian American people that their homeland shall be free.

Too often have we reminded ourselves of the glorious past of the Ukraine: its culture, centered around the University of Kiev; the richness of its soil which provided a mammoth sugar bowl and breadbasket for the commerce of Europe and Asia. Too often have we recounted regretfully its conquest first by Genghis Khan, and later by Peter the Great; its invasion and division by Poland and Austria. We have rejoiced with the Ukrainians over their brief period of freedom following World War I, a period during which the Ukraine was a democratic Republic.

Again today we have told the story of 4 years of bloody struggles with the Bolsheviks which terminated in Communist rule. We have recounted the purges, deportations, and genocide by which the Russians decimated the Ukrainian intelligentsia and leadership. But ahead we see the breaking of a new day of freedom.

Last June in the capital of the free world, people of Ukrainian blood proved to the world that their determination to be free is indomitable.

Today the Congress of the United States and the United Nations pay tribute to a nation whose determination to be an independent, democratic republic must be realized.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that in the district I have the honor to represent are many fine men and women of Ukrainian blood. Expectantly, confidently with them, all Americans of all lines of descent await the happy day when the Ukraine has broken the cruel chains of its bondage.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, first let me commend the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for reserving this special hour in the House. Naturally, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in these appropriate exercises to mark the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

Members of this House are well aware of the very significant history of this great nation and the long bitter struggle of its loyal, faithful people against oppression. It is most appropriate for us in the House to intensify our efforts for the cause of freedom for the millions of honest, God-fearing, religious-minded, democratically oriented peoples who are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

There can be no lasting peace so long as Red imperialism continues to hold men in bondage in denial of their God-given rights. If we and the rest of the free world continue our efforts for peace and freedom, the day will come when the Ukraine and all other subject nations may rejoice in the blessings of freedom and governments of their own choice.

I am proud to congratulate the Ukrainian people and their loyal descendants and relatives in this country upon the 47th birthday of their great nation.

The Ukrainians, though under the yoke of tyranny and oppression, have demonstrated in the past that they will never give up their aspirations and struggles to be free men and women.

It is also fitting that the House today be reminded of Congressman Flood's resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, with which I am proud to be associated as cosponsor.

There is no question that a committee of this kind could render great service, particularly to those oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain. I hope that the House will authorize such a committee so that the cause of personal liberty, democracy, and freedom can make itself heard more effectively.

These are troubled times in the disordered affairs of mankind and it is well that we pause today to commemorate the great contributions and sacrifices of

the Ukrainian people on the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

Let us also make it known on this day of Ukrainian independence that the American Congress, reflecting the wishes and sentiments of the American people, reaffirms principles of liberty, justice, freedom, human honor, and decency.

Long live free Ukraine and may that great land and inspired people soon regain in fullest measure the great liberties they cherish.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Ukrainian people in modern times is the story of a gifted, gallant, and industrious people ceaselessly struggling for their freedom and independence. These hard working and tenacious folk of the fertile steppe land tilled their bountiful soil for centuries for the well-being of all peoples in the whole of Eastern Europe. Irrespective of the regimes under which they suffered for centuries, they continued to perform their productive work and always hoped for better days. For more than three centuries, since the mid-17th century, they lived under the oppressive regime of Russia's czars. Since 1654, the Ukrainians have not been allowed, except for the brief 2-year period of 1918-20, to enjoy even the semblance of a free and independent life in their homeland. There they have endured hardships, privations, imprisonments, and death. They have been persecuted and oppressed relentlessly for clinging to their national ideals, for cherishing their independence and freedom.

But these oppressions and persecutions have at least had the salutary effect of uniting the Ukrainian people against their foes. Toward the end of the First World War, when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence on January 22, 1918, and established the Ukrainian Republic.

Unfortunately, the Ukrainian Republic at the time of its birth was surrounded by powerful and ruthless foes, all eager and anxious to pounce upon the newborn state and destroy it. Early in 1920, this Republic was attacked by Communist forces of Bolshevik Russia. Soon the country was overrun by the Red Army. All effective opposition was crushed under the hammerblows of Russian might, and the Ukrainian independence came to an end. By the fall of that year the country was annexed to the Soviet Union, and since then it has been submerged in the sprawling Soviet empire. Thus for more than 44 years Ukrainians have been suffering under Soviet totalitarian dictatorship. These 44 million, constituting the second largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union, have suffered more and have sacrificed more, both in the number of victims and in material wealth, than any other minority group in the Soviet Union. They have borne the heavy yoke of the Kremlin longer than all other groups, and have suffered longer under it.

Today the once prosperous and productive Ukraine is a land of unfortunate and unhappy millions where they all are held down and ruthlessly oppressed by

the agents of the Kremlin. The whole country is practically sealed off from free societies; thus they have very little contact with peoples of the non-Communist world. They have been robbed of all their worldly possessions under the Communist collective system. And their only inherited and cherished possession is their spirit of freedom, their hope for eventual national independence. Heartless minions of the Kremlin have even tried to deprive the Ukrainians of their spirit of freedom, but fortunately they have not succeeded in this task. Today even under the most relentless of totalitarian tyrannies liberty-loving Ukrainians cling ever tenaciously to their national ideals, still preserving their fervent love of freedom.

Both at home and abroad the Ukrainian people have been noted for their industry and ingenuity. They have never shunned hard, menial work. In this respect their tough and rugged physique and tenacious nature have served them well. Hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic, and hardworking Americans of Ukrainian origin have given their very best for the good of their adopted country. In many industrial areas they constitute the core of sturdy and hardworking laborers who perform difficult and onerous tasks with determination and distinction. We are indeed proud to have them as worthy citizens of this great Republic, and today I joyfully join them in the observance of the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the fair and fertile Ukraine, with its 230,000 square miles, is the largest country in Eastern Europe, and some 44 million Ukrainians constitute the most numerous ethnic group in the area. Throughout their long and turbulent history they had to struggle hard for the maintenance of their freedom and independence. They had been more or less successful in doing this until early modern times, but they have not been able to withstand the onrushing tide of Russian aggression since the mid-17th century.

Beginning in 1654, the Ukraine was submerged in the continental empire of the Russian czars. From then until 1918, for more than 250 years, the Russians did their worst to suppress and eradicate Ukrainian national feeling and all its attendant traits, such as their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their homeland, their undying yearning for political independence, and their readiness to sacrifice all for the attainment of their national goal. All the efforts of callous Russian authorities were of no avail, and the Ukrainians clung firmly to their ideals. Toward the end of the First World War, Ukrainian leaders seized upon the occasion of the overthrow of the czarist autocracy and proclaimed their national independence. This was done on January 22, 1918, and thus was born the Ukrainian Republic.

Unfortunately the new-born Republic, frail and fragile, was under several handicaps. Her friends could not help her. The war-torn country was in ruins, and most of its inhabitants were uprooted from their homes. These were serious problems with which the Gov-

ernment was confronted, but even more serious was Communist Russia's threat. Before the Ukrainian Government had the chance to bring some order out of the existing chaos, the country was attacked by the Red army, and overrun by early 1920. Thus ended the independent Ukrainian Republic, and soon the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Since then Ukrainians have not known freedom in their homeland. They have suffered more under the Soviet tyranny than did their forefathers under the autocratic czars. We know that under the Communist dictatorship the Ukrainians are not allowed to celebrate their independence day at home. That privilege is denied them by their overlords. But Ukrainians of the free world, as well as hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian-Americans in this great Republic, celebrate the anniversary of that event as the symbol of the Ukrainian free and independent spirit. I am indeed glad to join them in the celebration of the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the 47th anniversary celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day is a most fitting occasion for the reaffirmation of our dedication to the eventual liberation and freedom of all the enslaved nations under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Today the leaders and peoples of the free world have many onerous responsibilities. But all conscientious, thinking, and well-meaning human beings who are privileged to enjoy freedom as their birthright feel that they have a moral obligation to work for the freedom of many millions still held in chains. Nor are the governments of free peoples less conscious of this moral obligation, this solemn duty, toward human suffering, than the peoples they represent. All these governments, and especially the Government of this great Republic, are painfully aware of this obligation. And they are seriously concerned with the fate of the Ukrainian people.

The Ukrainian Republic was born on January 22, 1918, when there was a fair chance for its survival. Oppressive forces which had held the Ukrainians down for centuries were shattered, and thus they felt that their inveterate foes were no more. But in this they were sadly misled, for soon in place of old foes appeared new ones. Among these the deadliest was the then-rising Communists. It was the Red army of Communist Russia which finally put an end to the independent Ukrainian Republic and made the country part of the Soviet Union in 1920.

Since then millions of Ukrainians have been suffering under the unrelenting rule of the Kremlin. They have been robbed of their worldly possessions and they are deprived of all forms of freedom. They have been practically and quite effectively sealed off from the non-Communist world, and are driven by their Communist taskmasters. But in the midst of misfortune and misery these courageous patriots have not given up their hope for freedom, have not abandoned their national goal: the attainment of

their national independence. On the 47th anniversary of their independence day, I wish all of them fortitude and power in their struggle against Communist totalitarian tyranny in their homeland.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this observation of the Independence Day of the Ukraine, and to express the hope that the brave people of the Ukrainian nation will once again enjoy liberty and freedom before many more years have passed.

It has long been my belief that we could find no better way to express our sympathy with the people of the captive nations than to have an official observance of each of the independence days so dear to the hearts of the patriots who now labor under the heavy yoke of Communist imperialism. To this end I have sponsored in each of the last three Congresses a resolution to establish such a practice, and I ask leave to include with my remarks the text of that resolution, as follows:

Whereas the United States of America is dedicated to the restoration of liberty and self-determination for eight hundred million people enslaved by Communist imperialism; and

Whereas there exists in the hearts and minds of Americans a deep sympathy and understanding for the hopes and aspirations of the captive peoples; and

Whereas it is appropriate for Americans to keep alive the traditions of liberty symbolized by the historic national holidays of the captive nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President of the United States proclaim the following historic dates as days of observance by the people of the United States in their spiritual union with the victims of Communist imperialism and colonialism: January 22 as Ukrainian Day; February 16 as Lithuanian Day; February 24 as Estonian Day; March 3 as Bulgarian Day; March 14 as Slovakian Day; March 15 as Hungarian Day; March 25 as White Ruthenian Day; May 3 as Polish Day; May 10 as Rumanian Day; May 26 as Georgian Day; May 28 as Armenian and Azerbaijan Day; June 17 as East German Day; August 15 as Korean Day; October 10 as Chinese Day; October 26 as Vietnamese Day; October 28 as Czech Day; November 18 as Latvian Day; November 28 as Albanian Day; December 13 as Turkestan Day.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives today in paying tribute to the brave people of the Ukraine. It saddens me that this 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine finds its 43 million people still enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. I hope that all Americans everywhere will join in the observance of this significant anniversary and pledge support to the aspirations of these enslaved people.

The modern history of many east European countries presents a long series of miseries and misfortunes, with occasional happy, but all too brief, interludes. This is the general pattern of their history, and it is particularly true of the Ukrainian people. Since the middle of the 16th century, except for a very brief period of 1918-20, the Ukrainians have known no freedom in their homeland. But during that 2-year period, fate

seemed kind to them. On January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their national independence, established their own democratic Republic, and worked feverishly for the preservation of their richly deserved and newly won freedom. But this dreamlike existence was not to last long; before the end of 1920 the Red army cruelly robbed them of their freedom. Their country became part of the Soviet Union and once more they were enslaved by Russians, this time by Communist Russia.

The history of the domination of the Ukraine by the U.S.S.R. has merely been a repetition of the exploitation of the Ukraine by the czarist regime. It has been one of economic exploitation of resources and the labor of the Ukraine for the benefit of Russia. Many thousands of Ukrainians were deported to the desolate wastelands of Siberia.

For more than 44 years some 43 million sturdy and stouthearted Ukrainians have been suffering under the heavy yoke of Communist tyranny. Their homeland is the mere western extension of the Soviet empire, where they are restive prisoners. As such they are helpless in the shaping and making of their own destiny, but fortunately they will feel they are the masters of their souls. We in the West must give them encouragement and intensify our efforts by deed and word to bring some hopeful feeling to the distressed people of the Ukraine who look forward to the joys of freedom so long denied them. Many Ukrainians migrated to the United States. They have made great contributions to our country's strength, our intelligence, our culture, and progress.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to urge the Congress to approve the resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I am one of the sponsors of this resolution, and its approval would reinforce and strengthen the will and aspirations of over 43 million Ukrainians. It would reassure them of our determination not to forget them in their desire to once again become independent.

On this 47th anniversary of their independence day, I wish the people of the Ukraine forbearance and fortitude in their struggle for freedom.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of Ukrainian independence is observed each year on January 22. It was on that day in 1918 when the Ukrainian constituent assembly met and issued a proclamation reestablishing the Ukraine as an independent Republic after several centuries of Russian domination.

That Republic lasted only 3 years and by 1921 the Ukraine was again overrun by the Russian Communists. After a brief period of freedom the Ukrainian people again became a subjugated nation. The 45 million people of the Ukraine thus were among the first victims of Communist imperialism.

Throughout all these long years the indomitable desire of this brave but suffering people for freedom has not been extinguished. Their cause is a righteous one. The American people have always looked with a great deal of sympathy

upon the plight of the Ukrainian people and their struggle for freedom, and we have given them our support and encouragement to the fullest extent possible.

On this occasion of the anniversary of their independence, I join with many other Americans in saluting the Ukrainian people and expressing our hope that their cherished dream to see their country free will be fulfilled in the near future. There are numerous examples in history where enslaved and subjugated nations became free after many years of seemingly hopeless waiting. I trust the Ukrainian people will some day soon taste the joy of such victory.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that in marking the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence we mark also the passing of another year of Soviet enslavement of the Ukrainian people.

An easing of tensions between East and West has not produced a meaningful easing of the oppression and tyranny of their Communist masters.

It is well to mark this occasion and remind ourselves that the battles for freedom in Eastern Europe are far from won. The Ukrainian people fight on. We must never let them think that they fight alone.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate here today the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, we do so in the conviction that free men have an important stake in the freedom of peoples everywhere.

Observances such as the one in which we are participating today are evidence that Members of the House take this responsibility seriously. Our words and actions in the greatest representative assembly in the free world can bring renewed hope, stronger faith, and a deeper sense of what unites freedom-loving peoples to those who suffer oppression and deprivation in nations ruled by the enemies of freedom.

The people of Ukraine have a special claim to our understanding and support. Well over a million Americans of Ukrainian descent have brought to this country their love of freedom, their individual self-reliance, their deep spiritual values, and the riches of a distinctive culture. Since I am fortunate in representing a congressional district with a sizable population of people from Ukraine, I have known at first hand the extent and importance of their contributions and especially of their unfailing dedication to the goals of personal liberty and national independence for those who remain in the homeland.

The history of the struggle for freedom in Ukraine is a long and honorable one. The brutality of the Russian czars could not kill the people's determination to be free. Nor has the tyranny of Soviet commissars stifled the yearning for the rights of self-government. No people has suffered more for freedom. And despite the generations of persecution and oppression, the spirit of freedom burns as intensively as ever in the hearts of these brave people.

Just a few months ago, Mr. Speaker, in June of last year, a statue was unveiled in a small park in northwest Wash-

ington representing Taras Shevchenko, the great poet and patriot of Ukraine and the eloquent voice of Ukrainian freedom, past and future. The park is a small one, but it is significant both for what Shevchenko has come to mean throughout the world as a symbol of resistance to those who oppress mankind and—since the Congress of the United States authorized the use of the land for this purpose—as testimony of our own determination to speak up for freedom, to oppose dictatorship, to share the burden of those who suffer for liberty.

We are expressing this same determination and sense of kinship today, Mr. Speaker. And, in the same spirit, I urge our colleagues to renew and broaden their support of the pending resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Here would be an especially meaningful way in which to translate the ideals we uphold into action that can bring those ideals closer to reality.

We owe at least this much, not only to the Ukrainian people themselves, not only to their families in the United States, but also to ourselves and to our belief in man's right to live freely.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago peoples subjected to Russian autocracy cast off the heavy yoke of that oppressive regime and proclaimed their independence. To tens of millions the Russian revolution of 1917 seemed to usher in a new day; they all then sought and hoped to find their freedom in the overthrow of the czarist regime. At first their most sanguine expectations seemed justified, and by the end of the First World War nearly all ethnic groups in the continental empire had attained, or were about to attain, their national independence. The Ukrainians, as the most numerous and also as the most important of these nationality groups, had done this.

Since mid-17th century Ukraine had been part of the Russian Empire, and during all that time the Russians had tried to Russianize them by eradicating Ukrainian nationalism and national ideals, but their attempts were not successful. Liberty-loving and stout-hearted Ukrainians clung firmly to their traditional national ideals, and in 1918 they had their reward in freedom and independence. On January 22 of that year they proclaimed the Ukrainian Republic, set up their own democratic government and began to rebuild their war-ravaged country. Unfortunately, the independent state thus created did not last long. Ukrainians enjoyed their hard-earned independence for only 2 years; they then lost it to their inveterate foe, the Russian Communists. Early in the 1920's the country was attacked by the Red army; Ukrainians could not by themselves stave off this deadly threat. Soon the country was overrun, and their independent existence came to an end. Before long Ukraine was annexed to the Soviet Union. Since then, for more than 44 years, some 44 million Ukrainians have been captives of the Kremlin's Communist totalitarianism.

On the 47th anniversary of their independence day it is appropriate that we join them in its observance. We do

this gladly in the fond hope of seeing them regain their freedom and independence once more and live in peace in their historic homeland, in their fair and fertile Ukraine.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, all peoples struggle to attain their national goals, their freedom and independence, and after attaining these goals, they do their utmost to retain them. In this task some have succeeded well, while others have not been so fortunate, and through some freakish turn and twist in international affairs over which they had no control, have witnessed their own tragic failure in this supreme task. The Ukrainians have been among these unfortunate people. By the inexorable forces of nature their fair land has been surrounded by powerful and aggressive neighbors, and these have shown no mercy in their dealings with the Ukrainians. Among the cruellest of these neighbors have been, and still are, the Russians. In the past, before World War I, they had held the Ukrainian people in bondage under their czarist autocracy. When that autocracy was shattered in 1917, Ukrainians asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence on January 22, 1918.

That historic event seemed for a time to have turned a new page in Ukrainian history, but within 2 years, before the Ukrainian people barely had time to taste the sweetness and joy of their freedom, they were robbed of their richly deserved prize by the Red army of Communist Russia. That was in 1920, and during the last 44 years these ceaseless fighters for their freedom have known no freedom in their historic homeland. They have been held down under the unrelenting rule imposed upon them by the Kremlin. During all these years they have struggled hard to free themselves from the Kremlin's tyranny, but they have not been successful. On the 47th anniversary of their independence day we wish them success in future years.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for many, this past Friday, January 22 had no special significance, yet for Ukrainians and people of Ukrainian descent throughout the world this day was one of solemnity and reverence. Forty-seven years ago the Ukraine proclaimed independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic, amidst greedy powerful neighbors. This day marked the end of almost 300 years of foreign domination and oppression. However, the realization of their long-nourished dream for freedom was doomed to perish before 2 years were finished.

Soviet imperialists eagerly eyed this rich and fertile land and the skilled and vigorous people of its soil. Hardly had the Ukrainians had a chance to enjoy their independence than the Red army attacked the country and crushed all Ukrainian opposition. The Ukraine thus became a mere satellite of Soviet Russia, and within a few years was forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R.

Now the Kremlin boasts that the Ukraine is free and independent in the attempt of the new Russian ruling class to discredit the growing charges in the

free world that the Ukrainian nation is a captive people of Soviet imperialism. But we in the West are acutely aware of the Communist calculated transformation of the words "freedom" and "national independence." For them, the definition of Ukrainian independence is "national in form and Socialist in substance," which simply means that the Ukraine is allegedly "free" to develop within the structure of Ukrainian national values but only according to the "substance" or ideology of communism. Here is a serious contradiction of terms, for in reality freedom for the Ukrainians means that they are free only to obey Moscow's dictates, not to assert their own will. Nevertheless, it is clear that the Soviet Union has failed to destroy the Ukrainian spirit of freedom and self-determination.

We, as the leader of the free world, must never discourage the aspirations of captive nations. We must never allow the cause of freedom to suffer from any failure on our part. Indeed, we act in the highest American tradition when we raise our voices in behalf of those who aspire to be free and who wish to live a life of dignity and peace.

Americans of Ukrainian descent have made great and lasting contributions to the success of our political and economic system. They have defended our democratic institutions in time of war against totalitarian and imperialist foes. To these Ukrainian-Americans our Nation is ever grateful.

On this solemn occasion I, therefore, join hands with all freedom-loving peoples in commemoration of Ukrainian independence day. Let us all rededicate ourselves to the principle that has made our Nation great, the principle of self-determination, and let us pray that this principle will one day bring freedom to those who desire it.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the 22d of January is a significant day for every man who loves freedom. It was on this day, 47 years ago, that the Ukrainians, one of the great peoples of Eastern Europe, achieved their freedom. After centuries of being overrun by invaders, the Ukrainian people on this day in 1918 proclaimed their independence.

It was a freedom they fought hard for, and yet it was short lived. For in 1920 the budding union of all the Ukrainian lands was no more. It was swallowed up in the vast orbit of the Soviet Union. It was a bitter pill for the Ukrainians, who for centuries have been trying to repel invaders from their lands.

Though their liberty has been snuffed out, we here in the United States, whether of Ukrainian descent or just ordinary freedom-loving Americans, will never forget the 45 million Ukrainians now under Communist domination. We have memorialized in statuary, here in our Nation's Capital, Taras Shevchenko, that legendary Ukrainian poet who spoke loudly for freedom, and paid heavily with years of exile.

It is only fitting on this occasion that we pledge that their cause will not be forgotten as long as they are not free—free to worship their own God, free to

speak their own tongue, free to enjoy their own culture, and free to live their own lives in dignity.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Friday, January 22, 1965, marked the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukraine from domination by Soviet Russia.

In commemorating that occasion, free people all over the world once again raise their voices in encouragement and sympathy to the valiant Ukrainian people.

Despite years of domination by the Kremlin, the spirit of a free Ukraine still is enshrined in the hearts of her sons and daughters, both within the homeland and outside.

Despite the fact that the Ukraine has been suppressed by totalitarian powers, incorporated forcibly into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, deprived of their individual political, economic, and religious freedoms, the people of that land look forward to the day when the Ukraine will once again resume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It is my earnest hope that the people of the Ukraine will draw encouragement from the warm regard of the people of the United States for them. On this auspicious date, we extend our best wishes to the Ukrainian people and Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, and we pray that the oppression of their native land may soon be ended.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my thoughts to those of my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the most valiant people ever to grace this earth. We are gathered today to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian Republic. Our meeting this afternoon, however, is not a completely festive occasion, for while we honor the men and women who struggled to make the Ukraine a free republic we are also mindful of the terrible burden borne by those who today live in the Ukraine.

Recently, we have heard many overtures from the Soviet leaders that they desire cordial relations with the Western world. Might I suggest that these leaders, who for so long have unjustly considered the Ukrainians as Russians, release these valiant people from the shackles of Communist imperialism. Might I also suggest that the U.S. Government go on record recognizing the rights of the people of the Ukraine to be free and self-governing.

I have the honor of representing a number of loyal Americans of Ukrainian descent. Nothing could please me more than to see these wonderful people reunited with their loved ones. It would indeed be a joyous day in Syracuse and Onondaga County if the Republic of the Ukraine were released forever from the yoke of Communist slavery.

IS THE WAR ON POVERTY GETTING OFF ON THE RIGHT FOOT?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, since the poverty program has been authorized and it is obvious that funds will be made available for its operation, it is my hope that they will be used in places where poverty does in fact exist and will not be spread over the entire country like icing on a political cake. I also hope the program will not be out of tune with economic reality.

My purpose today is not to prejudge the poverty program. It is my purpose to raise thoughtful and honest questions in the hope that the administration will analyze them in the same constructive spirit in which they are raised.

On January 18 a grant for the State of California from the Office of Economic Opportunity was announced: \$3,811,265 was granted to the counties of Contra Costa, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Shasta, Ventura, and Santa Clara in California; \$795,900 was granted to Santa Clara County to retrain 2,075 men and women with 6,200 dependents. The object of the retraining program will be to "lessen the impact of seasonal unemployment by removing deficiencies in skills that have limited public assistance recipients to seasonal jobs."

The trainees, the Poverty Office announced, will be given instruction as homemakers, and home health center and day care center aids.

I am privileged to represent about two-thirds of the county of Santa Clara. For 10 years before the recent reapportionment I represented all of Santa Clara County. For a moment, let us look at Santa Clara County and at what it has been doing for itself to assist those who are less fortunate and who are in need.

Santa Clara is a county of about 857,000 persons. It is recognized as the fastest-growing county, economically speaking and populationwise, in the United States. We have recently completed a beautiful new welfare building. Our county welfare department employs about 700 people. About 300 of these are qualified social workers, and there are 70 supervisors. The board of supervisors has recently authorized additional social worker positions.

Last year Santa Clara County disbursed almost \$33 million in welfare funds. Including administration, the cost of programs administered last year by the Santa Clara County Welfare Department was in excess of \$38 million. A little more than \$16 million of this came from the Federal Government, \$13 million from the State of California and Santa Clara County contributed approximately \$9 million from local resources.

Santa Clara County is considered to be one of the most progressive counties in the Nation in welfare programs. Its district attorney has instituted a vigorous program to apprehend "weekend fathers" of children who are under the aid to needy children program. The Santa Clara County officials have recommended legislation that would allow chil-

dren in the program to earn small amounts on the outside without penalty. This was recommended on the theory that earning some money might provide an incentive to earn more, and eventually take families off the aid to needy children program.

Santa Clara County officials have advocated legislation to make aid to needy children payments payable in the form of grocery orders in instances where a mother has a record of irresponsibility and has been known to spend her aid-to-needy-children payment in some local bar or tavern.

The Santa Clara County Welfare Department in the State of California has pioneered in retraining and reemployment programs. It has an active program today of placing welfare recipients in gainful employment.

I am proud to say that Santa Clara County is known and conceded to be the most progressive county in the State. This makes the county I represent one of the most progressive in the field of welfare in the entire Nation.

Under the new poverty program, it is mandatory that every welfare recipient be processed and considered for retraining under the Federal poverty program. Because of other legislation passed in the last Congress, local welfare agencies are now required as a practical matter to reduce the case loads per social worker from an average of 90 to 60 cases. One of the few shortages of available skills that we have in the State of California today is that of social workers. We cannot hire enough social workers. Now with this new requirement imposed upon our county by the poverty program, the shortage will become even more acute.

I heartily agree with the objective of the poverty program that welfare recipients should be taught new skills so that they are not solely dependent upon seasonal jobs, but present indications are that this new program will not be training Santa Clara County people for jobs that are available. In fact, it may well be training them for nonexistent jobs.

The State department of employment conducts a continuing labor market analysis for the Santa Clara County area. This analysis as of last week showed that the only jobs available in Santa Clara County, and which are unfilled, are for specialists in electronics, specialized engineers, for social workers, for pharmacists, for registered nurses, licensed vocational nurses, machinists with production experience, competent stenographers and secretaries, mechanics and domestics who will "live in."

Since 35 percent of the \$795,900 grant given to Santa Clara County last week for the California work-experience program will be spent to transport and to feed trainees lunches and dinners and to provide other supplemental assistance, this means that there will only be an average of \$249 spent on retraining each of the 2,075 trainees who have been designated under the program.

Obviously this will not be enough to produce the professional skills which are needed, such as specialists in electronics, social workers, pharmacists, registered

nurses, licensed vocational nurses, machinists, competent stenographers, and competent secretaries. Yet these are the skills which are needed today in Santa Clara County. So, this program may only train more persons to compete for unskilled jobs which are in short supply.

As an example of what I believe may well be unrealistic planning which is out of tune with local economic reality, I point to my own hometown of Gilroy, Calif., in Santa Clara County. My home city was recently designated as a "pocket of poverty" by a Columbia Broadcasting System film and by poverty program officials. Such a designation is unfair to the city of Gilroy. An unrealistic retraining program based upon the assumptions which naturally follow that designation will have little chance of success.

By all the economic indicators, the city of Gilroy is enjoying a wave of prosperity, along with the rest of the Nation. We have had a steady increase in bank and savings and loan deposits, which set an alltime record in 1964. When the 1964 figures are known, postal receipts for Gilroy may be nearly double the figure for 1959, only 5 years ago. School population in Gilroy has increased by almost 30 percent since 1959. The dollar value of building permits has continued to climb to new records, and three times the number of new homes were started in 1963 than were started in 1960. Per capita wages and personal income increases in Gilroy compare favorably with any other area in the Nation.

Statistics show that Gilroy is hardly a pocket of poverty. Any broadcasting network or any Government agency which calls it such is guilty of overgeneralization and is hurting the chances for the future growth of a thriving, progressive community.

Though it is changing rapidly, Gilroy is still primarily an agricultural community, and much of its employment is seasonal. Many migrant families who work all over the State return to Gilroy for the winter in anticipation of occasional winter jobs and the "thinning" and "hoeing" which comes in early spring. They have made Gilroy their permanent home, because they like it there and because its agricultural employment season is longer and more stable. So a portion of each winter's welfare caseload is due to the fact that Gilroy is a better agricultural community in which to live.

The seasonal labor requirements of communities like Gilroy will not disappear so long as God's world is geared to the seasons of the year. Crops and food will continue to grow in the summer and will require seasonal labor. If the retraining program is successful in making year-round homemakers, or health and day care center aids out of Gilroy's seasonal workers, then it is obvious that new seasonal employees will have to take their places. They, too, will probably remain in Gilroy because it is a better place to live.

The bracero program has ended despite a continuing farm labor shortage, and now it appears that an effort will be made to remove domestic workers from seasonal employment, including

agriculture. This is an inexcusable disregard of economic reality.

A poverty program should start with the recognition of the economic need of local areas and should preserve, rather than eliminate, the type of work force which the area needs. After this is done, then an effort should be made to find additional employment in the same area during the slack season.

There are countless possibilities for expanding employment opportunities during the off season which can be tailored to the economic realities of individual areas. In Gilroy, for example, it might be possible to extend the canning season to include nonperishable foods like dried beans, soups, meat products, and specialty foods. Workers could be trained to wire electronic subassemblies in their own homes on a piecework basis. And small baking and confectionery plants could be organized to utilize locally produced dried fruits during the winter season. To accomplish this, it is obvious that financial and tax incentives must be offered to companies to allow them to overcome the competitive disadvantage of operating on a seasonal basis. Labor unions would have to cooperate and relax some of their work and apprenticeship rules in order to open up year-round employment for the worker who is seasonally unemployed. Doing these things will not be easy, but they are the only ways in which an agricultural community can stabilize its pattern of employment.

Reducing seasonal unemployment is a desirable objective but it must start on the right foot instead of the approach being used in Gilroy and similar communities. It must complement existing employment opportunities instead of removing them.

When we come to the point where we are spending \$795,900 in localized work-training programs as in the Santa Clara County, the programs must be adjusted to fit local problems.

I definitely fear this is not the case in Santa Clara County.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

A VOTE OF CONFIDENCE FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the most recent Republican candidate for President has made a statement which, among other things, casts a serious reflection upon the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Goldwater is quoted by the national press as having said, at the recent meeting of the Republican National Committee in Chicago, held on January 22:

I wasn't dishonest enough in the last campaign to win. In order to win campaigns one must be dishonest or a little bit dishonest.

If this statement means what it purports to mean, then Mr. Goldwater is accusing every duly elected official in the United States of dishonesty. Mr. Goldwater is in effect attacking, not a political

party, but a political system: the very system of which he is so ardent a supporter. In effect he is saying that in a democratically structured society it is impossible for a man to be elected by the people without resorting to dishonesty.

If this is his meaning, then I find myself impelled to ask the question: Is this doctrine of the inevitability of dishonesty uniquely applicable to democracy? Are we to infer that there is something about our free society that brings out the worst, rather than the best?

Let me remind those who resort to such fallacious generalities that this was the argument of one Adolph Hitler, in his takeover of the German Reich. During his rise to power he found his most vicious and most effective weapon to be the systematic disparagement of democratic processes, in the eyes of the German people. He, too, argued that democratically conducted elections were dishonest. Once that idea became firmly implanted, the death knell of freedom quickly followed.

Perhaps Mr. Goldwater was inferring, not so much that democracy, as an abstract concept of government, bred dishonesty, but that it did so only in the case of America. This position, in my opinion, is even less tenable than the first. Let me remind the gentleman that America today stands as the chief exponent and the supreme example of democratic government throughout the world. If this supreme example turns out to be supremely bad, how can it be argued that the system which produced it is supremely good? How can America argue to the underdeveloped nations of the world that they should move in the direction of democracy, if one of their chief exponents takes such a dim view of the way in which it functions?

I hope that this tempest in a teapot will turn out to be nothing more than an unfortunate slip of the tongue on the part of the gentleman from Arizona. Or, perhaps the gentleman was misquoted. If so, I strongly urge him to set the record straight.

If there is one proposition on which Democrats and Republicans alike can agree it is that in America we have the noblest example of self-government in all the history of mankind. This is my own affirmation, and I would urge all who so feel to make themselves heard.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the statement attributed to Mr. Goldwater is true as it has been reported it is certainly one of the most amazing statements that I have ever read coming from a man who has not only run and lost an election but who has run for office and won elections.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, with which I agree.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to talk primarily about certain aspects of the budget, but in light of the remarks just made by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING], I would like to observe that I think from what he quoted Senator Goldwater, he has misconstrued the meaning; not that Senator Goldwater himself would conduct such a campaign, but that such a campaign had been conducted. I regret to say—and I think there is constant concern in our society about demagoguery and how campaigns should be conducted with adherence to the truth—I regret to say that there is a school of political scientists, and I think I can describe it as a school, who actually teach what I call neo-Machiavellism; that the way to get things done in the Congress, for example, is through pressures and not through deliberation and consideration of the merits.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that in witnessing some of the things that have happened in the 14 years that I have been in the Congress, that seems to be the technique that is deliberately employed by certain people in government, to propagandize the people in respect to labels on issues, instead of discussing the very serious differences of opinion that do exist between those who have studied the measure, both Republicans and Democrats, and permit the Congress to deliberate upon these matters.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would share with the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] the thought that our Government is one of the best examples in history, if not the best example, of how government by the people can operate. However, the disease which he points out so well is something that forces us to be constantly on our guard against it.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I will yield to the gentleman in just a minute.

Mr. Speaker, as I interpret Senator Goldwater's words, he is telling the people what he thinks did exist. I am not entirely sure but what he was right.

Mr. KING of Utah. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Would the gentleman not agree, however, that my statement to the effect that no person in this country can be elected to public office without indulging in dishonest practices is a most deplorable statement and a reflection upon our great democracy?

Mr. CURTIS. If it is untrue, it is deplorable. But if it is true, it is something we had better pay a great deal of attention to. I must say that I am beginning to wonder whether in any sizable campaign, based upon the way the news media reports or fails to report, whether indeed this might be the case.

So I would answer the gentleman from Utah by saying that indeed I share with him his concern about the seriousness of the charge. I then say let us get to an examination of what the situation is

with reference to campaigning in America today, as to whether or not the issues as they pertain, or the development of the issues as they pertain to social problems, are intelligently discussed, or whether or not it does not represent a battle of labels and an exchange of ignorance which goes on in much of our campaigning.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Utah. Would the gentleman not agree that it is most important that we establish the fact, once and for all, that under this democratic process, the overwhelming majority of the elected officials both in this body, and in the other body, as well as in the executive branch of our Government, are elected through honest rather than dishonest practices?

Mr. CURTIS. That is the issue. That is what our people should consider. That is what everyone here in this room should really be concerned about. I am wondering about it. I am not going, just through oratory, to pose the things I would like to believe, for example, that we have lived up to these fine traditions and that thereby we have them.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time that we begin to take stock of ourselves here in the House as well as the manner in which our political campaigns have been conducted. A great personality cult is growing up in this country where we are not discussing political issues in political campaigns at all, but human beings and human frailties instead of great issues. I think the gentleman has put his finger on something that is very serious and I do not believe he is remiss in referring to what can happen, if it did happen in the recent political campaign, where demagoguery becomes rampant. But I say let us not dismiss this with fine oratory about how we wish it were not so. I say we had better pay direct attention to it, to correct it if it is even partially so.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the discussion which I wanted to have in regard to the budget. It has some bearing on this very point of reporting honestly to the people. The budget presented to the Congress actually is a request for new obligational authority. The President has asked for \$106.4 billion of new obligational authority for fiscal year 1966. In the budget also—but one has to dig for it—is a request for \$6 billion of new obligational authority for fiscal 1965. This serves two purposes. I refer to the chart on page 15 which contains the President's request for new obligational authority. The chart relates to the previous year and it makes it look like his new request for authority of \$106.4 billion is actually less than the obligational authority of 1965, which was \$107.3 billion. But the \$107.3 billion figure would be \$101.3 billion—\$6 billion less but for the request in this 1966 budget message for \$5.978 billion supplemental new obligational authority for 1965. One purpose served, then, is to make the request for new obligational

authority in 1966 seem less than the request in 1965 when actually it is \$11 billion more.

The second point. This \$106.4 billion is subject to the same criticism that the \$101 billion request in the 1965 budget which was presented to the Congress last year now reveals it is subject to. That is, it has deficiencies inherent in it. Probably there will be a deficiency bill of around \$6 or \$7 billion presented at the next session of the Congress to make up for this new understatement of NOA requests. So that the real request for new obligational authority is going to show up to be \$112 billion or \$113 billion for fiscal year 1966. This, however, is not the main tenor of what I wish to discuss.

NOA is what the Congress is concerned with; namely, the requests for \$106.4 and \$5.978 billion new obligational authority. The public attention through the press releases of the executive department has been directed toward the expenditure level of 1966, which is stated in the budget to be \$99.7 billion and Congress has little to do with this. On page 43 of the budget one gets a clearer understanding of the distinction between the request for new obligational authority, which we call our appropriation bills, and the expenditures in a given fiscal year. Incidentally, this is only revealed in a table, table 8, page 43. But there is no text accompanying this table to explain it, but the main thrust is there for anyone to see.

There is the new authority recommended to the Congress of \$106.4 billion. Below it in the table is the unspent authorizations enacted in prior years, \$96.7 billion carried over. So if the Congress votes new authority to spend \$106.4 billion that will be added to the \$96.7 billion, which would give the President \$203.1 billion in authority to spend in fiscal 1966 if he were to choose, or to let any portion of it go into the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 if he chooses.

But, then, the President has said he will only spend this \$99.7 billion. He will not spend the \$106.4.

Again, at the bottom of the table is the carryover in unspent authorizations for expenditure in future years beyond 1966. It accumulates to where there are \$101.5 billion carryover for July 1, 1966, not the \$96.7 that will be available as a carryover beginning on July 1, 1965. It will be increased by another \$5 billion.

The Congress has no control over the expenditure level in any given fiscal year. This has been the unresolved problem in this legislative body. That is the fait accompli that comes to this Congress and the Ways and Means Committee when we have to consider the problems in the field of debt management. There is no way in which Congress can actually produce a balanced budget in a given year. The request for new obligational authority is not related directly to the expenditure in a particular fiscal year. It is these new obligational authorities, plus those we have not used and have accumulated that gives the President his total authority to spend. The Congress has no way of exercising judgment over the rate of expenditure in any fiscal year

save by one cumbersome means and that is by the debt ceiling.

That is why I take the floor at this time to point out that the President in his budget, page 26, has stated that he is going to have to ask for an increase in the debt ceiling this year under the assumptions of this budget. The debt at the end of fiscal 1964 is \$312.5 billion. The debt at the end of fiscal 1965 is estimated to be \$316.9 billion, and the debt at the end of 1966 is estimated to be \$322.5 billion. See page 26 of the budget.

The present debt ceiling is \$324 billion. We have to have \$5 or \$6 billion, which is a low figure, in working cash. So it is very clear that the \$324 billion debt ceiling will not be adequate to handle this kind of expenditure even if the President limited himself to the \$99.7.

If the Congress wanted to cut that \$99.7 billion expenditure level down for fiscal 1966 it could hold the debt ceiling at \$324 billion and might even lower it and reduce the expenditure level to say \$95 billion. Certainly Congress could hold it to \$324 billion, and say to the President: We think that because of problems in the field of debt management we should not increase the debt further, that we already have problems as far as managing the Federal debt is concerned which are contributing to our gold outflow, which underlies the imbalances in our international payments, which are bringing about increased prices of goods and services which makes it more difficult for us to compete in the international marketplace, and so creates unemployment.

The inflationary forces that we have already set loose will be furthered through this process.

The point is that the Congress will have only one way in which it can exercise its judgment over the actual budget for fiscal 1966 as far as it relates to total expenditures in relation to our revenue. We are going to collect only about \$94.4 billion, according to the President's Budget, leaving us shy under his estimate of expenditures by about \$5.3 billion.

It is when it comes time for the Committee on Ways and Means to consider the question of whether or not we should increase the debt ceiling that Congress will have this one very inadequate, I might say, method of exercising its judgment over the basic fiscal policies of this country which relate to a balanced budget.

I have long argued that the Ways and Means Committee should develop the technique of using the debt-ceiling legislation as a method whereby Congress exercise an independent judgment over what Congress felt the actual balance in the budget for the fiscal year should be. We have not developed these techniques, I must admit. I must also say that even if properly developed it is a cumbersome way of handling this problem.

In the Reorganization Act of 1946 the Congress did attempt to set up a process for developing a legislative budget. This too proved cumbersome, and the technique has never been used, although

it is still the law. The members of the Ways and Means Committee, of the Appropriations Committee, of the Senate Finance Committee, and of the Senate Appropriations Committee, are supposed to meet each year and prepare a legislative budget that relates expenditure to our income so Congress can consider the difficult problems that are involved, the economic problems that are involved in our debt-management policy.

So I urge the Congress and the people to keep their eyes on the fate of the bill which will be introduced at the request of the President to increase the debt ceiling.

ASSISTANCE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES WITH DEPENDENT PARENTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under our Social Security Act special provision is made to allow for extra benefits to those beneficiaries who have other persons dependent upon them. These special provisions have been applied to the case of the beneficiary's spouse and his dependent children, but at the present time no added benefit is given for the beneficiary who also has dependent parents to support.

Cases have been called to my attention in which social security beneficiaries, even those receiving their benefits under the normal retirement provisions of the OASDI, support dependent parents and I see no reason why we should not treat parents as we do any other person dependent upon the beneficiary in establishing the amount of benefits to be given. For this reason, I have today introduced legislation which would provide monthly benefits for dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age or disability social security benefits.

This proposal does not increase the overall top benefit which may be paid on a single account. However, where the top benefit level has not been reached, this would be effective to increase the monthly payments and help defray the beneficiaries in supporting their dependent parents.

A BILL TO AMEND THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a companion to the bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], chairman of the

Foreign Affairs Committee, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

This proposed legislation will provide a 4-year authorization of \$55 million for the fiscal years 1966 through 1969.

The authorization under which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is currently operating will expire on June 30, 1965. The need for arms-control measures was never so obvious as now when more countries are acquiring a nuclear capability.

Since the Agency was created in 1961, we have taken three significant steps in the field of arms control: The nuclear test ban treaty, the establishment of the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow, and the United Nations resolution calling upon all nations to refrain from placing nuclear weapons in outer space.

The presence of an increasing number of nuclear nations makes an already insecure world even more shaky. Developments in recent years have shown us that military superiority can no longer guarantee stability and security. The day has passed when the strongest nation is the most safe and secure nation.

President Kennedy put it eloquently when he said "as our power has grown, so has our peril." Weapons and their accumulation alone can no longer guarantee security.

William Foster, the Director of ACDA, said recently that "the road to peace and arms control is slow and arduous, but it is one which we must travel." The approval of this bill by the Congress will take us another important step along that road.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS: IMPLEMENTING THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT REMAINS A SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I addressed the House on the subject of the Alliance for Progress and the significant advances that have been made in the past year. The Alliance's third annual review meeting at Lima, Peru, last month highlighted a year's activity in which through U.S. assistance alone 300,000 homes and 26,000 classrooms will have been built; 11 million textbooks will have been printed; 280,000 agricultural credit loans will have been extended; 850 health centers, hospitals, or mobile health units will have been built; 1,500 wells and water systems will have been drilled or installed; and food will have been provided for 22 million people, by the middle of this year. These are some of the tangible results of inter-American cooperation and efforts under the Alliance for Progress.

But despite the significant advances of the Alliance, significant problems remain. Not the least of these was the failure of the 88th Congress to pass the

implementing legislation to the International Coffee Agreement. Fears and criticism of protectionist actions on the part of the United States, largely as a result of our inaction on the coffee agreement, were expressed to Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann at the December meeting in Peru.

The background of the International Coffee Agreement is well known. But it is important enough to be repeated, for widespread understanding on the part of the Members of Congress is essential if we are to act wisely with respect to our policy with the nations of Latin America.

In 1957 the coffee-producing countries of Latin America and Africa attempted but failed to establish a worldwide system of export regulation of coffee. Because of the great fluctuations of coffee prices on the world market such an agreement was considered necessary as a stabilizing influence. Why is stabilization needed in this industry? Because in several of the Latin American countries, principally Brazil, coffee exports exercise a dominating influence on the national economies, and if the coffee industry in those countries is not stable, then their economies will not be stable.

In 1958 the United States took the lead role in seeking a long-term solution to the coffee price problem. Through the then Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Thomas Mann, a coffee study group made up of the major coffee-producing countries and the major coffee-consuming countries, was created to study the entire matter and to recommend a solution.

In 1962, with the United States again in the lead, the coffee study group proposed the establishment of the International Coffee Agreement as a long-term solution to the problem. That summer a meeting was held in New York City with representatives of the countries involved, under the auspices of the United Nations, and the International Coffee Agreement was negotiated. The U.S. Senate ratified the agreement in May 1963. To carry out its responsibilities under it, enabling or implementing legislation was required. It is this implementing legislation which Congress failed to pass last year.

It is a fact that several Latin American countries are built on a one-commodity or a one-crop economy. The dangers inherent in such economies are obvious. It is therefore important not only to the well-being of those countries but to the well-being of the entire Western Hemisphere that those one-crop economies be diversified. Diversification is one of the major aims, if not the major aim, of the Alliance for Progress. For a nation to prosper and progress it must be stable. In order for it to be stable its economy must be stable, and a diversified economy tends to be more stable than a one-crop economy.

So diversification has been an important goal of our policy in Latin America. It is for this reason that the U.S. Government helped promote the International Coffee Agreement. We want the one-crop countries based on coffee to diversify. But they cannot diversify if they cannot sell even their one crop.

And if they do not sell their one crop they will not be stable.

In July of 1964 Senator WAYNE MORSE, warned that "a rejection of the agreement would be costly to us as far as the development of misunderstanding in Latin America is concerned." This was a prophetic warning which we in Congress would now do well to heed. Misunderstanding has developed in Latin America over our failure to carry through with our end of the International Coffee Agreement. This misunderstanding was clearly and amply demonstrated last month at the meeting in Peru. Our representative to the meeting, Thomas Mann, stated at that time in response to Latin American criticisms of the United States:

I share your disappointment that our Congress did not pass in its 1964 session, the implementing legislation to the coffee agreement.

It is imperative that the 89th Congress act favorably on the implementing legislation at the earliest possible time if we are to support our end of the bargain entered into when we signed the International Coffee Agreement and when it was ratified by the Senate, and if the Alliance for Progress is to go forward.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD, two articles from the New York Times by Juan de Onis concerning the problems I have touched upon. The first, dated December 7, 1964, is entitled "U.S. Trade Bars Feared by Latins"; the second, dated December 9, 1964, is a report of the December meeting in Lima, Peru, and is entitled "Mann Asks Latins To Avoid Attacks":

[From the New York Times, Dec. 7, 1964]
U.S. TRADE BARS FEARED BY LATINS—ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS URGED TO FIGHT RESTRICTIONS
(By Juan de Onis)

LIMA, PERU, December 6.—Latin American fears of U.S. trade protectionism have generated the most discordant issue of an Alliance for Progress conference here.

The United States cast the lone vote against a report by a committee on foreign trade that would give the Alliance's coordinator, Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, precise instructions to fight trade restrictions.

The report was prepared at the technical level of the Alliance and is subject to study by a ministerial-level meeting that began yesterday. Dr. Sanz Santamaria indicated that he would seek a compromise solution during negotiations this week.

Meanwhile, Chile's new Christian Democratic Government opened what promised to be a prolonged fight against the present structure of the Organization of American States and Gen. Jose Antonio Mora.

FUND'S TRANSFER URGED

The Chilean delegation proposed that a "special assistance for development fund," now under Dr. Mora's control, pass to the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress, a steering group that is headed by Dr. Santamaria.

Behind the move to shift the \$8 million fund, the Chileans said, was a policy to strengthen the steering group, a "new dynamic body," and to reduce the influence of the OAS on the hemisphere's economic and social development programs. The Chileans described the OAS as "archaic" and "discredited."

The Alliance for Progress is a 10-year program established in 1961 by the American Republics, with the promise of \$20 billion in U.S. aid and investment, to further economic development of Latin America and to encourage social reforms.

ACCESS IS AN ISSUE

The two new issues facing the review conference reflected the growth in the prestige of the steering committee, a body set up at the Alliance's review meeting in São Paulo, Brazil last year.

The Latin American preoccupation with U.S. trade policies centers on real or feared restrictions on access to the U.S. market for Latin America's basic exports and on possible declines in commodity prices.

U.S. delegates told the Latin American representatives that President Johnson would renew in the next Congress the administration's fight to obtain final ratification of a stabilizing agreement for the world's coffee prices.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 9, 1964]
MANN ASKS LATINS TO AVOID ATTACKS—SEEKS REASONABLE ATTITUDE TOWARD U.S. TRADE CURBS

(By Juan de Onis)

LIMA, PERU, December 8.—The United States asked its Latin American partners in the Alliance for Progress today to be reasonable and avoid "unnecessary divisions."

Thomas C. Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, gave his response at the Alliance's third annual review meeting to a succession of objections by Latin American delegates to U.S. actions on international trade.

These criticisms included the failure of the U.S. Congress to approve legislation to implement the world coffee price stabilization agreement, a lapse in U.S. sugar import legislation and Congressional endorsement of meat import quotas.

"Much has been said here about protectionism in the United States," Mr. Mann said. "I share your disappointment that our Congress did not pass, in its 1964 session, the implementing legislation to the coffee agreement."

He went on to observe that "President Johnson has publicly stated that the enabling legislation will be resubmitted to the next Congress."

RESTRAINT ON SURPLUSES PLEDGED

Stressing that the United States buys 40 percent of Latin America's exports and pays in convertible currency, Mr. Mann said that the United States would "continue to exercise restraint in the export of our surplus commodities." Some of the exports, such as wheat, cotton, and meat, compete with basic Latin American exports.

The Alliance for Progress is a 10-year program in which the United States has joined 19 Latin American republics, with the exception of Cuba, to accelerate their economic and social development. The United States has pledged \$20 billion in public and private capital to help reach goals of economic growth, housing, education, health, and rural reform.

Mr. Mann said that there had been "solid achievements" this year in the development of a steering organization for the Alliance's work, the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, a former Minister of Finance in Colombia, is the chairman.

"It has completed the first cycle of country-by-country studies ever made in our hemisphere," Mr. Mann said. "It has recommended specific and concrete courses of action to countries and international organizations on how to accelerate progress."

URGES BETTER EXECUTION

He went on: "What is needed now is better execution, better performance by all of us in

the Alliance * * *. If we can continue to work honestly and sincerely for human progress, rather than for short-term personal or political advantages of individuals or groups, we shall see an ever-growing number of countries join those who have already achieved viable and relatively self-sustaining economies."

Delegates from Chile, Mexico, and Ecuador gave major emphasis to the desirability of direct international financing for the economic integration of Latin America.

The weakness of Latin America as a bloc in negotiating trade relations with the United States, the European Common Market, and the Socialist bloc led by the Soviet Union was mentioned repeatedly.

Mr. Mann said that to increase export earnings the Latin Americans should diversify exports and try to sell in greater volume, as well as "get on with the job of making the Latin American regional trading arrangements more effective."

He also laid heavy stress on private investment as a stimulant to economic growth.

PERPETUAL EDUCATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the January 1965 issue of Harper's magazine considers one of the many devices presently being developed for the purpose of raising the level of competence in a world where vocational requirements grow increasingly more sophisticated. Speaking in general terms of the whole problem of education, the author makes some quite startling, but obviously correct, statements:

Neither white-collar nor blue-collar workers can expect to make a lifetime career out of what they have been instructed to do for their present jobs.

Nobody will be safe from instruction.

Some of the subject matter (required for those who can get and hold jobs) will have been taught to generations of learners. Some won't exist until next year. Some will be taught once only, after which the surge of new information will erase the subject.

We have in the United States 25 million adult men with less than eighth-grade education and at the other end of the educational scale we have upward of 3 million males enrolled in college-level courses. Add to these the men in the armed services and Government services, and all of the men learning jobs in industry, and you have a considerable segment of adult males who are, or ought to be, under formal instruction.

What the author said about men would presumably apply with equal force to women.

The old idea of finishing your education must be thrown into the discard. Training for future needs has become the major concern of the young. Their elders must accept the thesis that they too can learn—in fact, that they must learn—as long as they draw the breath of life.

It is fitting, then, that all of us should adopt education, both general education and specialized education, as the No. 1 problem of this period of national life. A casual survey of current discussion of

the problem reveals the present existence of at least four major attacks already marshaling their forces. It may be desirable to look at each briefly.

First, there are the regular State and local public school systems. These have been spurred to action by criticisms of the quality and quantity of their instructional programs. Interest has been focused on three separate groups of potential students: First, the college-material type who do not go on with their education due to lack of financial resources or to a degree of indifference; second, the dropouts who are insufficiently motivated to complete the training easily available to them; third, the older unemployed who need retraining for jobs presently available. A variety of proposals are under consideration by public school systems to take care of each of these groups. In a few cases, an ambitious program to take care of all these groups in one institution has been projected; one such for Greenbrier County, W. Va.

The second major attack comes from recently established Federal programs designed primarily to furnish retraining for unemployed youth and adults in underdeveloped areas, such as those contemplated in the poverty bill passed in the 88th Congress and the Appalachian bill which is proposed for the consideration of the 89th Congress.

Third on the list is the well-established training programs conducted first, by the armed services of the United States and, second, by most of our big private industries. The armed services offer as an inducement for enlisting a thorough training in skills which are useful to the services, and which are equally in demand in private life after the enlistee completes his military service. Private industry has also found it expedient to set up training programs for all employees from the lowest ranks up to potential supervisory and executive material. Programs intended to teach the various skills required for workmen are customarily carried on in the industry's plants. It is a type, or an extension, of the old and well-known system of apprenticeship. Supervisory and executive possibilities may be sent to universities and technical schools at company expense.

The fourth attack on the educational front is one that is just getting underway, but it may have important results. Press reports indicate that a number of leaders of the various Negro groups which have been fighting for civil rights assert that they intend to shift their emphasis to a positive program for better job training and retraining. Several organizations are sponsoring vocational training, some of them aided by Federal grants and some by private grants. Said one of the leaders:

We have to move into the much more difficult area of trying to upgrade the whole Negro community so that we can achieve the educational, economic, and political equality which are necessary if we're to make full use of the freedoms which we are fighting for and winning.

The movement is important because it furnishes a necessary stimulus toward action which must be implemented by

other agencies. That is, it must be absorbed in one or more of the other movements.

All these attacks on the educational problem may be regarded as experimental. They are forced on the agencies and institutions involved by necessity. Doubtless the armed services and industrial organizations would prefer to select most of their recruits from individuals already possessing the basic training for the services they are chosen to perform. The fact that they do not possess such training forces them to act in their own interests. The cost is considerable, and the time spent in training is lost for productive uses. Nevertheless both the armed services and industry have been highly successful in developing the skills they need. They have two advantages working for them. First, they do not have to deal with the population as a whole. They can and do select individuals who give promise, in their judgment, of being able to learn what they wish to teach. The armed services, for instance, do not offer specialized technical training to all their recruits; only to those who can pass appropriate tests. Second, and probably more important, the incentives to learn are very strong. The learner can see clearly the way to position, to prestige, and to higher pay.

It must be admitted that Federal projects to retrain displaced workers have not been significantly successful. In the case of a number of apparently well-planned projects, newspaper reports indicate that only a minor fraction of those eligible for the training take advantage of it. Various reasons may be assigned for this lack of interest. But the underlying reason must be that the training prepares for only possible jobs, not real and certain jobs. There can be no guarantee that the learner is going immediately out of training into a satisfactory and paying job.

A recent TV documentary program dealt with efforts to transplant unemployed coal miners from West Virginia to copper mines in Montana. The workers were said to prefer mining to other occupations. The copper mines needed workmen. Working conditions were not importantly different. The pay was good, in fact, better than pay in the coal mines because the copper mines operated continuously rather than intermittently. One miner indicated that the average workman could make \$40 per day. Several hundred workmen were brought to Montana. But many of them returned to West Virginia after only a short stay. Various reasons were given: separation from families; a strange and unfamiliar social environment; protection of seniority and pension rights in the coal mining industry. Emotionally, they were not prepared to make the change.

The author of the Harper's magazine article referred to above puts the situation in a nutshell: "It is amazingly difficult to instruct adults." All teenagers will agree with this.

Now consider the case of the public schools. They have been playing with the idea of vocational instruction for generations. Federal support for training in agriculture and in home economics

began early in the century. A general estimate might be that such training has been only moderately useful. Few of those enrolled in the courses took their work seriously. More recently the schools have added instruction in various manual arts. These have suffered a similar mediocrity of success.

The controlling fact is that the public schools are oriented toward the promotion of literacy. They have been so oriented from the beginning of our national history. They have been continuously admonished that a successful democracy is composed of a literate citizenry. Their programs of instruction and their techniques of instruction have been developed and refined with the object of producing literacy. This laudable aim must be, so far as we can see, their continuing dominative interest.

Several things have happened in modern times to make the drive toward universal literacy insufficient for our needs. Something must be added.

The public schools have acquired an enormous prestige. Their work has been accepted as the key to success in life. In their prepossession with literacy they have unintentionally conferred prestige upon literacy, with a corresponding lack of prestige on practical arts.

This is a wide departure from ancient ideas of the educated man. In all ages, the educated man was the man whose practical skill matched his mental preeminence. The great men of history were doers as well as thinkers, whether it was in the field of the arts, or science, or the professions, or government. An educated mind apart from an educated body was unthinkable, as it should be.

The public schools, taking as their prime function the development of the mind, have unfortunately created the impression that skill of mind is ennobling, while skill of muscle is not necessarily so, and may even be degrading. Those whose inherited or acquired aptitudes drive them toward manipulation of things rather than toward manipulation of ideas get the feeling that they are the rejects of society. They resent it, and so come to resent the public schools which foster the idea, however unintentionally.

A second development of modern times is the almost complete separation of the modern working world of the adult from the learning world of the child. A few generations ago it was possible for the school to confine itself to literacy because the child was in daily contact with the various operations necessary to feed and clothe the world, to provide shelter, or to make and operate the mechanical contraptions which facilitate production. He learned about doing outside of school, not only how to do, but why it was necessary to do. Today there is no segregation so absolute as the segregation of the working world from the learning world. The school is an artificial society. Anyone who has had experience in trying to teach Johnnie to read is aware of the difficulty of finding words which appeal to his experience. He has no acquaintance with the things or acts which express meaning in the working world. Things come to him from some benevolent source without his knowledge of how or why they come.

The child is confined in this artificial society until, hopefully, he has grown adult in body. Then he is thrown out into a working world, and is expected to conform to its requirements. He has not been prepared for his responsibility. But he has finished his education. He wants to make a lot of money, and quick. He has no notion of fooling around playing with the children any longer.

In a truly comprehensive and totally sufficient school system, all these elements must somehow be brought together and synthesized. The whole educative process must be accepted as a unity, beginning in infancy and continuing through life. It is important to do and it is important to learn so that we may do better. Experience and training must be synonymous. Some of us will work mainly with things and others will work mainly with ideas. They are equally and mutually status occupations. Our society needs machinists and typists and lawyers. It would be foolish to abolish segregation based on race and set up an even more rigid segregation based on membership in a labor union or in the American Bar Association.

It seems logical and inevitable that most of the details of total education will come under the management and direction of the public school system. To scatter them around among diverse agencies would destroy the unity which education is supposed to produce. The school system has the organization around which direction could be effected most economically. It has the technical know-how of the teaching job. It is accustomed to the job of selecting and grading material for the various stages of learning.

What it lacks, of course, is money. Money is needed both to provide equipment and to train and pay the personnel that would be required to operate a comprehensive system. The total cost would be enormous, measured by modern standards.

Some 50 years ago macadamized roads began to be built in quantity. The cost of macadam roads at that time, if memory is correct, was something like \$8,000 per mile. It was considered an extravagant outlay, but probably worth it. A few days ago a modern highway through open country was put in use. It cost, said the newspaper report, \$1 million per mile. And that would be cheap if built through thickly settled areas. Thus do people's notions about cost versus value change in a short time. So far no education speech or publication has even dreamed of such escalation applied to the schools.

Both the administrative and the legislative branches of the Federal Government have expressed interest in providing increasingly larger sums for what is called general education. The problem is how and where to apply the money so that it will do the most good. There are problems of public education versus private education, State and local control versus Federal control, distribution of funds according to need versus per capita distribution, and so on. In lieu of finding some common ground for agreement on these issues, it may be tempting to set up more and more proj-

ects designed for specific situations and needs. A more promising procedure might seem to be to boldly grasp the principles which would govern an effective modern educational program, and to disregard the political considerations involved in the controversial issues. Otherwise the goal of a training system that will prepare every individual for effective participation in modern life will be moved still further into the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. KING of Utah, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON), for 1 hour, on January 27.

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON), for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

All Members (at the request of Mr. MAHON) in the body of the RECORD on the President's budget message.

Mr. DORN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLLAND.

Mr. LINDSAY and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STANTON.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVINS of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and further ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on this subject today may revise and extend their remarks, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the whole world shares the sorrow of the family and friends of Sir Winston Churchill, a

world citizen of extraordinary dimensions, who on yesterday departed this life in the city of London.

Of all men who have lived in the 20th century, Sir Winston may well have lived the fullest life. For more than 90 years he walked among us as one of God's noblest and most remarkable creatures.

Sir Winston, the articulate spokesman for the cause of free men in World War II, was unquestionably the one man behind whom all the forces of freedom rallied in the fight against Nazi and Fascist tyranny.

He was the first outstanding public figure in the world to warn against the threat that Hitler posed.

He was the first to raise the warning flag, as disciples of appeasement began to raise their heads among the free nations of Western Europe. There are many, he said, who would feed the crocodile only to be devoured by him in the end.

Among all public men whose lives and careers were identified with World War II, Churchill's name stands pre-eminent.

But, Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill's leadership in this era is not his only claim to historic recognition. Had he passed on even before Hitler's armies began to march, he would have had a prominent place in the annals of his country. He was acclaimed as the best debater in Parliament and was the unchallenged prince of British orators for more than half a century. He was a fighting man of great courage and talent—an author of rare distinction. Of all those who spoke the English language in this century, Winston Churchill spoke it best. In his speeches and in his writings, he demonstrated again the strength and the beauty of Shakespeare's language. Rugged, determined, articulate, witty, courageous, he was every inch a man. Historian, philosopher, and statesman, he as much as any other human being understood and raised his voice against the dangers of tyranny from both the right and the left.

This generation and the world in which it lives—future generations and the world of tomorrow—all who will ever cherish freedom will owe a lasting debt of gratitude to Sir Winston Churchill.

Today in sorrow, respect, and affection, we salute this great man. This man whose life was wholly affirmative. This man who in battle would accept only victory. This man whose courage never faltered. This champion of liberty who was unbending in his determination to preserve Christian civilization against the onslaughts of evil despots.

Mr. Speaker, we in America proudly and rightfully share in the glory of Churchill's fame and rejoice in the scope of his accomplishments. The son of an American mother, the first and only honorary American citizen in the history of this country, an ally and friend in every major battle, we can say that Winston Churchill was in a very real sense one of our own.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the flags fly at half-mast—as prince and pauper offer their last farewells—all good men rejoice that Winston Churchill passed our way

in our day and generation. He hung his star high. Among history's most distinguished statesmen, he has set new patterns of human achievement which aspiring youth may seek to emulate for years and centuries to come.

As his countrymen mourn him and lay his remains to rest, decent men and women everywhere will surely proclaim: Well done, thou good and faithful servant, in whom we are well pleased.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, from time to time in the history of nations there emerges a man, as human as the rest of us, but one able to capture for himself and his country the respect and imagination of all of us. By native intelligence, force of personality, diligent effort, determined leadership, and a sense of the historical, Sir Winston Churchill became that kind of man.

He belongs first of all to Great Britain but every nation in the free world is richer because he lived. The entire world has felt the impact of his work and the fullness of his spirit.

England has lost a leading public figure. Mankind is bereft of a symbol which has stood for the finest qualities in our humanity: courage, tenacity, ability, dedication—all used in the eternal struggle for freedom and justice.

We in the United States join our fellowmen everywhere in mourning the passing of one of the great men of our time. He is gone but his work remains as an inspiration to us and all who follow.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, England, the United States of America, and all of the world have lost a vigorous, effective, and most successful champion of freedom, democracy, and decency, the Right Honorable Sir Winston Spencer Churchill.

During World Wars I and II, Sir Winston was the cannon, the ammunition, the ramrod, the warhead, and the marksman which literally blew Britain's enemies and those of world peace out of the water with a direct hit. Of course, our great Nation came to Britain's aid—but Sir Winston had called the war shots with the phenomenal accuracy endowed with a clairvoyant mind.

His famous "blood, toil, sweat, and tears" speech in the House of Commons on May 13, 1940, mobilized the talents, the ingenuity, and the challenge, stirred the hearts, and provided the inspiration that turned the tide against Hitler. It came at a time when Britain stood all alone.

My colleagues, on March 12, 1963, I made a speech here in the House urging the passage of legislation that would confer honorary citizenship upon this truly great statesman of the world. This legislation had been introduced by all of us who were members of the Immigration

and Nationality Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how hard I tried here today, I sincerely do not believe that I could pay Sir Winston a better tribute than was contained in my March 1963 Churchill speech. So, my colleagues, if you will please be so kind as to forgive me and bear with me, I will quote a few excerpts from my previous remarks about this resolute, valiant, unconquerable Englishman. I quote:

To find words adequate to describe properly this distinguished man is comparable to gilding the lily, bringing cotton to Alabama, the derby to England, and good bourbon to my native Kentucky.

His bravery, his fortitude, his tenacity of purpose, and his unyielding desire to win shall never be forgotten.

In my opinion, his achievements shall stand out forever like the Washington Monument, Big Ben, the Eiffel Tower, and the pyramids. By his unselfish service to mankind, he has emblazoned his name with honor and everlasting distinction in huge letters of gold on the silver pages of world history. Why? Because during war, travail, "blood and tears and sweat," fear, want, privation, devastation, chaos, and despair—at a time when it seemed all was lost—this incomparable leader was the epitome of hope, the very embodiment of courage, the preserver of time, the protector of faith, the guardian of destiny, the inspiration for victory, and the successful negotiator of the peace.

Quoting further:

To paraphrase one of his own famous statements: "Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to one man."

May he have a full fruition of his dreams and a happy realization of all of his endeavors. May his leaf never wither and whatsoever he doeth, may it prosper. May God in His infinite wisdom spare and protect our beloved friend, Sir Winston, for many years to come and may He who reigns as the King of Kings, the Master of all lodges, nations, and men, smile graciously, abundantly, beautifully, and everlasting from His wide blue canopy of heaven upon this, our worthy candidate for the position of the world's most honored peacemaker since that lowly Man walked the shores of Galilee many centuries ago. * * *

Thank the Lord, he did not place his light under a bushel, but on a candlestick and it giveth light unto all in the house.

I trust that Sir Winston will forgive my inadequate words of praise—and I say this from a humble heart—because, unfortunately, not in America nor in England nor any place else on the face of the globe, is there another Churchill with the command of the King's English which he alone possesses.

My colleagues, this great but humble man, when he had heard that I had made this speech, wrote me the following letter which I prize so dearly and so highly that the original is now framed along with a picture of President Kennedy signing the legislation into law, and one of the pens with which he signed it:

MY DEAR CHELF: I am indeed obliged to you for the very agreeable things you say about me and for the graceful way you expressed them. Pray accept my good wishes.

Yours very sincerely,

WINSTON CHURCHILL.

May the Good Lord bless Lady Churchill and all of their wonderful

family in this great void which has come to them.

The Good Lord, in his infinite wisdom, as I see it, literally lent us Sir Winston and allowed us the benefits and fruits of his labors for lo these past 90 years. Obviously, He could not allow us to retain forever this magnificent leader of men and so the Master has called Sir Winston back to that mansion of rest on high. The free world thanks you dear Lord for the loan of Sir Winston.

Again, I repeat from my 1963 speech: "Hail, noble Englishman. Hail, great American."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his very eloquent tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the distinguished majority leader in paying my own small tribute to a great statesman, a great man and a great Englishman, Sir Winston Churchill. We are all in his debt, as the majority leader has already indicated, whether we be Americans or citizens of some other country.

The quality that has always stood out above all others, in my judgment, in the career of Sir Winston Churchill, is courage. He displayed physical courage as a war correspondent and when he was a young subaltern on the fields of India and of Africa. He displayed great courage and indomitability as the leader of the free world and of his own country in the dark days of World War II.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think there is another aspect of courage that perhaps has been overlooked in the career of Sir Winston Churchill, and that is the courage he displayed, the moral courage, in his unwillingness to alter or compromise or ignore his own beliefs and convictions simply because they were not at the time very popular. We know Sir Winston as the great leader of his country. But let us not forget that only a few months before he was called, on May 10, 1940, to take over the war leadership of his country, he had been, at age 65 already tabbed as a has-been, a back-bencher, a dissenter who was unable to agree with members of his own party and sometimes members of other parties, too, simply because he had refused to back down from his deep conviction which he held throughout the 1930's of the urgency of rearming England to deal with the growing menace of Hitler's Nazi tyranny.

The fact that Sir Winston was right after all was brought out only because of his courage and determination in sticking by those views even though they were for too long a time unpopular with the majority of Englishmen.

Mr. Speaker, last November 30, on the occasion of the 90th birthday of Sir Winston Churchill, I happened to be in London as a member of the Naval Reserve on training duty. Although I realized that it would be difficult if not impossible to see Sir Winston at that time, and though I had never seen him personally at all, I could not resist the temptation to walk around to Hyde Park Gate, and to walk down that little cul-de-sac and stand

there for a few minutes in front of his home at No. 28.

As we pause here today in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to Sir Winston Churchill, I cannot help feeling grateful that I had this opportunity last month to stand there for a minute or two to pay a small and silent tribute to one who has done so much for the free world; who so brilliantly demonstrated that the institutions of democratic, parliamentary government can indeed deal effectively and efficiently with the forces of totalitarianism in time of crisis; and who has been and will surely always continue to be an inspiration to every one fortunate enough to serve in elected public office.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and at this time I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, never have so many people of so many nations owed so much to the courage of just one man.

A friend described the courage of Sir Winston Churchill as "a fixed resolve to see the thing through to its end."

The glory of the courage of Sir Winston Churchill was that he had courage in sufficient quantity to share it with and bestow it upon 50 million people of the British Isles.

When the Battle of Britain was on, when invasion of England seemed imminent, Winston Churchill, as the late President Kennedy said, "Mobilized the English language and sent it into battle." He marshaled words the way generals marshal their troops.

Who knows what caused Hitler to postpone and later to cancel his invasion plans, but when he did so, he must have had ringing in his ears those Churchillian words:

We shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender.

On a later occasion, Sir Winston said:

It was the British that had the lion's heart, I had the luck to be called upon to give the roar.

The roar of that brave man will echo throughout all eternity.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], for taking this time today. I would like to join in the stirring remarks delivered here today in tribute to one of the great giants in history, Sir Winston Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that the epitaph on Winston Churchill's tomb would read, "He dared to be different."

Throughout his entire life of public service, the world saw this man time and time again rise above the clamor of popular opinion. Time and time again he spoke out in defense of positions he felt to be just. He was not concerned with popularity, but with principle. His soaring individuality kept him from marching in a single cadence with men

too blinded by tradition and prejudice to see the stars above them. He was able to capture and lead the spirit of the world in its darkest moments and its moments of ultimate victory. He was "Winnie"—and unconquerable.

It would seem to me that a study of Sir Winston's illustrious career in public service, and his great contribution to literature and to the arts should be an inspiration to all of us. "Each of us," in the lines of an old poem, "passes this way but once." Winston Churchill trod that path with three generations of men. Yet, in his record of achievements in that single lifetime we can find solace, confidence, and courage. He did, indeed, dare to be different and the results will illuminate the history of the world. May he rest in peace.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the world will remember Sir Winston Churchill in many different ways—the politician, the statesman, the world leader. But the people of the Third District of Georgia will particularly remember those dark years during which our boys left their training bases at Fort Benning and Warner Robins to fight beside Sir Winston's gallant British forces.

Winston Churchill's memory will long live in the hearts of Georgians—and freedom-loving men everywhere. Perhaps, at this moment in our history, it is fitting to consider the words of this great man:

If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight when all the odds are against you with only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than to live as slaves.

May America, Mr. Speaker, be ever mindful of his words, as we carry on his work in search of freedom for all men.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to personally thank our outstanding majority leader for his not only reserving this time today but being so generous and so magnificent in giving those of us who really idolize this great man, Sir Winston Churchill, an opportunity to say a word about him.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Missouri delegation I should like to recall one of the great contributions made to the world by Sir Winston Churchill in an appearance at Fulton, Mo., the home of Westminster College.

It was back in March of 1946, as the personal guest of my fellow townsman President Truman, that Sir Winston Churchill first coined the expression, "the Iron Curtain," which now has become a symbol of the barriers separating the free from the enslaved world. In prophetic words he warned us that unless the free world banded together in common defense against Stalin, Europe would undergo the same order of tragedy she had experienced under Hitler.

I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war—

He said—

What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines.

Then the indomitable Englishman defined the Communist character in a way that was to be echoed over the next few years by President Truman, by our Secretaries of State, and by the other leaders of the free world:

From what I have seen of our Russian friends and allies during the war—

He said—

I am convinced that there is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for weakness, especially military weakness.

These remarks, Mr. Speaker, set the tone for the alliance policy of the next decade and a half.

The man who uttered these words is no longer with us. But his spirit and his forceful ideas will continue to live on, both in the written history of the post-war epoch and in the policies of the Western Alliance.

We own an incalculable debt to him. We have already recognized that indebtedness once by bestowing honorary American citizenship upon him, the same honor given once before to the French General Lafayette after the Revolutionary War. We must now acknowledge that indebtedness in another, more lasting manner. Our greatest tribute to him would be to remember his message and his example.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for all of Missouri and particularly for the city of Fulton and for Westminster College, when I say that today we are all filled with grief and are all mindful of the lasting contributions of this heroic public figure. We all share the grief of his loved ones. May his good soul rest in peace.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the great truths of this hour that the only individual in more than a hundred years, who is not an American, and yet could evoke the profound sense of bereavement Americans feel so emotionally today, is Sir Winston Spencer Churchill. What he did in our time established for him and for the people of Great Britain an immortality on the noblest levels of human achievement. The depth of our pride, as Americans, in this man, is the more astonishing for its intensity because this hero of our century was so distinctively and so absolutely an embodiment of the greatest qualities of his people. His voice, even, as we heard it on the floor of this very Chamber, his

stance, his language, made him the incarnate hero of the hour during one of the world's most agonizing periods of travail. Yet this Englishman, born of an American mother, became more than ever one of our own, by the principles he espoused and the cause he fought for.

It is to the enormous credit of this greatest European statesman of the last several hundred years that at no time during the grand alliance or after, did the slightest stigma arise between the two greatest English-speaking nations on basic questions of mutual integrity, mutual good will, mutual respect. The great man on this side of the Atlantic, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the great man of 10 Downing Street—Winston Churchill—represented within themselves the lofty idealism and the decency of character of their respective peoples. It is not so much that the oratory of this brilliant Englishman was touched with flame and the quality of endurance so long as English will be spoken, but that he used this mighty tool on behalf of freedom. It was a weapon that in its time will be equated by historians with the majesty of moving armies and the power of the most intrepid battalions in the chronicle of warfare.

It is not enough to say that we so intensely admired Winston Churchill because, of course, he intensely admired the American people, and the American tradition of liberty. We have been, as two nations in two World Wars ideologically on the same track, fighting against what became in world history an affliction of afflictions when the unspeakable Nazis took over in Germany. What Winston Churchill did not only for his people, but for all the free world, was to sharpen the confrontation so that no one could fail to understand the monumental meaning of the cause of freedom against the ferocity and the ruthlessness of this barbaric threat. By the same token he has since—and mostly in a speech on American soil—revealed with identical sharpness to the whole of mankind, the meaning of the newly expanded threat he defined under the term "Iron Curtain."

Most of all to the average man Winston Churchill presented the human personality in its finest manifestation of courage, conviction, and solidity. In this, we like to think, he was most like us, and essentially one of our own. Indeed, in our own way and with the highest regard for the English people, we sought to claim him as one of our own when we here in the Congress voted him an honorary citizen of our country. He was the very personification of valor when he led his people and the free world to victory under the guns and the overwhelming might of the German onslaught, finally with the fullest support and cooperation of President Roosevelt and the American people, fighting shoulder to shoulder. We join with the British people and the free people everywhere in the expression of the grief we feel and the pride we take in having lived in the same period of world history with this great man, this American citizen, this outstanding hero in the crisis of crises that finally brought an ugly despotism of our time to book.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to join with those millions of persons around the world in paying tribute to Sir Winston Churchill.

He is gone. Yet his words, deeds, and spirit will live as long as freemen walk this earth. History will record few men who answered the call and met the challenge of public service with the wisdom, intelligence, statesmanship, and determination of Sir Winston. His achievements were remarkable in view of the formidable tasks which he faced.

Americans have admired, respected, and held Sir Winston in warm personal regard for decades.

The people of Tennessee were among the first in the Nation to show their esteem for this great leader. In 1963, the Tennessee General Assembly adopted a resolution making Sir Winston an honorary Tennessean.

Two years ago, as a member of this body, I was honored to join in sponsorship of the resolution granting him honorary U.S. citizenship.

A great man has passed our way and the world is a better place for his service to the cause of freedom and liberty.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the world mourns the passing of Sir Winston Churchill, whose words and deeds, whose courage and dedication to the cause of freedom and peace will be long remembered. But particularly must his own people feel a deep sense of loss, for in their darkest and most perilous hours they called upon him to lead them against their most bitter and destructive enemy. He gave all of his talent, all of his strength, and all of his wisdom to this struggle and called forth from his people the determination and valor which brought victory.

And we in this country feel a close kinship with this man of our age, whose friendship and warmth for our people have given us a sense of pride that we were privileged to know him. He has gone from the scene, but the substance of his greatness will live in the pages of history and be a source of inspiration to future generations.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, this day we stand in tribute to the great statesman of our time, Sir Winston Churchill. In such a moment the deep sense of loss felt by all can only be second to our continuing gratitude that the world was given his example to follow, an example of integrity, courage, and faith.

His mark has been dramatically recorded not only on the character of his beloved England, but on the other nations for which he fought so gallantly.

Sir Winston was time and again tested; without fail the challenges were met. He was an honorable winner who knew the responsibilities of victory. He was a noble loser, gracious yet proud in defeat. This tremendous fighter for good, this statesman and soldier, has always been close to the heart of America.

As Churchill made history he also recorded it, leaving a wealth of documentation on our times and guideposts for the future. Though the man is gone, his spirit lives on. His strength of character and record of service to humanity

will continue to inspire men to ever nobler achievements in generations yet unborn.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleagues in an expression of deepest sorrow at the passing of Sir Winston Churchill, and in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of this distinguished world statesman.

In common with American citizens throughout our country, and with freemen everywhere, the people of the district I have the honor to represent regarded Winston Churchill as one of the greatest men of our century.

He was indomitable in time of war and a great champion of freedom and liberty in days of peace and always.

We mourn his passing as we would the loss of a cherished member of our own family circle.

He spoke our deepest thoughts in times of stress and great difficulty.

He taught us anew the meaning of courage.

He asserted the greatness of the human spirit in words and deeds that gave inspiration to multitudes of freemen everywhere.

As he was fond of recalling, Winston Churchill was half American and he made us feel that we were bound together by something even greater than ties of blood, shared traditions and our common language.

Many of us recall when he came to America as Prime Minister and spoke to a joint session of the Congress. He commented on his relationship to our country and the fact that his mother was born in America. He told the Congress that if his father had been an American and his mother British instead of the other way around, that he "might have made it here," on his own.

The fact is that he did "make it here" on his own.

His permanent constituency does include all of America.

In voting last year to confer honorary American citizenship on him, the Congress acted to formalize the universal recognition of Citizen Winston Spencer Churchill as one of our own.

In America, we have no titles of nobility. The designation of "citizen" is the highest honor that can be bestowed on an individual in our land.

We loved this gallant Englishman as a warmhearted friend and ally, at the same time that we acclaimed him as a peerless leader. We can never forget Citizen Winston Churchill. We can never forget his command to fight, to preserve and never to surrender, in the struggle for liberty, justice, freedom, and peace.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my constituents in the Second District of Illinois would wish me to express their grief at the passing of Sir Winston Churchill and to join in this tribute to his memory.

In a very large sense he was one of us. Perhaps no man more completely blended the spirit of the peoples of two great nations, that of the United States of his mother's birth and the England of his father and his father's family.

He was truly beloved by the people of the United States as he was beloved by the people of his native land. He gave a new depth of meaning, of eloquence, and of force to our common language.

It was not long ago that the Congress voted to confer honorary American citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill, and now that he is gone I am sure we all feel more than ever a quiet sense of satisfaction that during the lifetime of this good and remarkable man this recognition was given.

Mr. Speaker, while the youth and the prime of Winston Churchill were active and colorful, it was not until he had reached the age of 65 that the mantle of greatness began to envelop him. If there had been a rule or a law in England such as obtains in some businesses, and some of little vision would fasten upon all public as well as private employment, that anyone on reaching 65 must be eliminated by compulsory retirement, Sir Winston Churchill in the dazzling brilliance of his genius would have been lost to the world.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, when one feels compelled to speak out on the passing of a great man, the limitation of one's own vocabulary becomes sharply defined. When the great man is Winston Churchill this deficiency of expression becomes even more acute.

It has been said that for Englishmen, of all the races on earth, any task undertaken in an adventurous spirit acquires the merit of romance.

Winston Churchill personified the spirit of adventure. For him life was one long romance. It was a relationship in which the past was only a prelude to be thoroughly understood so that he could better appreciate today in preparing for the challenges he anticipated tomorrow.

For Winston Churchill, history was a subject to be studied, a record to be set down, events to be directed. All of these he did in what has become known as the Churchillian manner.

He himself commented it is foolish to waste lamentations upon the closing phases of life.

We shall follow his counsel. These few words are not voiced to lament his passing but to express our appreciation he was here.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in the tribute we pay today to an honorary citizen of this country, the son of an American beauty, who accomplished so much in his lifetime to maintain the freedom of the West.

His deeds are many and they are worth study and emulation. He was a giant among men. Though he once said that it was the British people who had the lion's heart and he only had the luck to give the roar, it was his voice of defiance, his spirit of determination which was more than a frail reed, more than an uncertain trumpet in the West's hour of need.

Because he took positive stands in so many trying moments, there are those who find it difficult to forgive. Yet the world has benefited from his pugnacious and resolute being, from his imaginative and fighting spirit, and from his leadership.

This leadership transcends all petty worries and leads us to sorrow with the British at the passing of such a great figure. We saw him, in the world's moment of crisis, working closely with our own great leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in bringing victory to the West. We have seen him, in his waning years, giving counsel to the West, contributing history of first water in quality to the traditions of our youth.

Let me add my condolences today, then, to those which are being expressed by the House to his family, to his nation, and to the world.

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting that the American flag should be flown at half staff in memory of Sir Winston Churchill.

It is appropriate, also, that we pause today in this House of Representatives to pay tribute to a great Member of the British House of Commons.

Winston Churchill's great talents developed and flourished in the British House. His skill in debate, his wise and ominous warnings to the British nation and to the world, and his long, difficult experiences in behalf of unpopular causes prepared him for the hours of greatness which came to him. This greatness, associated as it was with courage and fortitude, enabled Great Britain to survive amidst the most devastating attacks upon the British Isles.

The strength and courage of this man provided hope and inspiration to Britain's Western allies, as the long, hard road to victory began—and Winston Churchill challenged one and all with fingers raised in a symbolic "V" for victory.

It was a personal privilege to be part of the 88th Congress and to support H.R. 4374 which made Winston Churchill the first and only honorary citizen of the United States.

The people of the 12th District of Illinois, as well as citizens of the entire world, join in tribute to Winston Churchill's life of service and leadership.

It was a glorious hour when Winston Churchill rose to encourage faith and strength in his British countrymen and the free world. Today, it is a dark hour as the world mourns his passing.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, today the world mourns a great statesman.

In the passing of Sir Winston Churchill, all mankind has lost a friend and leader. Today, as we mourn his passing, we are consoled with the realization that we have been privileged to have had such a man among us.

A lifetime of training, of bitter disappointment, was suddenly shunted aside at a time when many men have retired from life's labor, as he was called to lead his nation, and even the world, in one of its most trying hours.

The freedom of dignity of every man was at stake as the Fascist hordes enslaved vast areas of the earth's surface. And it was Winston Churchill's lot to fall heir to the most trying position that a man has ever tried to fill.

With his cheery countenance, his bulldog determination, his unflinching patriotism and devotion to the cause of freedom for every man everywhere, he

became the man of the hour. Never in history has so much been demanded of a man.

And in response, he gave.

We cannot know the agonizing suffering which must have been his. We cannot know the full impact that these responsibilities must have had, as he realized that what he did might well determine the course of freedom. And it did.

His flashing "V" for victory sign gave hope to a beleaguered people. Where there was no hope, he gave hope—where there was misery he gave comfort—where it was darkest, he gave light. Truly, it was one of the finest hours for all men everywhere.

Today we are blessed because he gave. As his mortal remains are deposited with all the honor that his beloved land can give him, he has the love and appreciation of all freemen everywhere.

History has just begun to judge his contributions. They are legend. To paraphrase his own immortal words, "Never have so many owed so much to just one."

The world is richer because of his life. From him we should draw inspiration. Never can a statesman study the past, for the key to the future, without drawing on the life and works of Winston Churchill.

He is gone from us, and we mourn his passing.

But we are richer for his having been with us. Nations and men from this day forth will humbly thank the Creator for having allowed such a leader to emerge when one was so needed.

From his determined spirit, we willingly accept the torch and the responsibilities which he passes to us. A new generation now must lead, and they will lead better because of his example, his courage, wit, and determination.

The pages of history will record his deeds. As has been so aptly stated, surely this was the man of our century. From his passing, let us resolve that we will have learned from his life, that we may strive for a world where hunger, disease, ignorance, and enslavement may be abolished. His dream was our dream. And it shall come to pass if we have faith, and we give of ourselves as unselfishly as did this man we honor today.

He is gone, but he can never be forgotten.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, with countless others I mourn the death of Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, but even more—much more—I am grateful for his life and the contributions which he made during that life of four score years and ten.

Unquestionably he was the outstanding Briton of this century. It is possible that he was the outstanding leader of the English-speaking people. More than that of any single person, his courage, his faith and his indomitable will provided the leadership which led the United States, Great Britain, and our Allies to victory in World War II.

His prescience was a marvel of both warfare and international politics. He foresaw events before they occurred; and when they did occur, he already had the answers to questions and the solutions

to problems. Fortunately for us those answers and solutions were accurate ones—this was fortunate not only for his country, but for ours as well.

We shall gratefully remember him as long as there lives an American or Englishman who remembers 1939-45. We who have heard or seen or met him will never forget him. History will honor him and accord him a high place on any list of great men of all time.

As head of the Government of Great Britain and as British leader in war and peace, he is without a peer.

As both a speaker and a writer he was a master of the English language. On June 4, 1940, I vividly remember listening to a radio rebroadcast of his speech on Dunkirk to the House of Commons; and I especially remember these words:

We shall not flag or fall. We shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender.

Winston Churchill did not surrender and he never had any intention of doing so.

A fortnight later, on June 18, 1940, he said:

Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say: "This was their finest hour."

And men will also say with accuracy that in "their finest hour," Winston Churchill was their finest man.

In a radio broadcast on July 14, 1940, he said:

We shall defend every village, every town, and every city. The vast mass of London itself, fought street by street, could easily devour an entire hostile army; and we would rather see London laid in ruins and ashes than that it should be tamely and abjectly enslaved.

Winston Churchill loved his country, his people, and his island. Even more, he loved freedom and he meant to maintain freedom for his people and his island. This he did.

He has earned an enviable place in English literature. He was a prolific writer and with his pen he mastered our language as he did with his speech.

As President Kennedy said when he proclaimed Sir Winston an honorary citizen of the United States:

He mobilized the English language and sent it into battle.

The contributions of few writers can compare with his three-volume biography of the Duke of Marlborough; his multivolume history of World War I, "The World Crisis"; the six volumes comprising his "The Second World War"; "The Gathering Storm," "Their Finest Hour," "The Grand Alliance," "The Hinge of Fate," "Closing the Ring," "Triumph and Tragedy." Following that, he published "The History of the English Speaking People" and "Island Race."

In war he demonstrated resolution. In victory he was magnanimous. In peace

he provided good will. Now in death, he leaves behind a grateful people in England, in this United States, and throughout the world.

In the minds and hearts of freemen he will be their patron saint—the patron saint of freedom.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, a titan has left our midst. Those legendary and historical inhabitants of Mount Olympus and Valhalla have willingly moved over to make room on the front bench for one of our age who need acknowledge no peer.

No human throughout our history has faced more Herculean challenges successfully than he. No one has been vested both with the prescience and the courage, ability, and opportunity to both combat evil and advance the cause, not just of his own people, but of humanity everywhere.

His life spanned generations; his talents knew no bounds. Greatness never marred his humility; reverses never dampened his integrity or his resolve.

Those of us who shared, even briefly, Sir Winston Churchill's time on earth know that the age of heroes is not over.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, with profound sorrow I join my colleagues and countrymen in expressing grief over the loss our world suffered yesterday with the passing of Sir Winston Churchill.

We have lost a stalwart statesman whose four score and 10 years of vigor and vitality occupy a prominent part of the history of our times.

Let it not be forgotten that the United States has lost not only a fond friend and able ally but also an honorary citizen. I shall always remember the honor which I felt as a freshman Congressman in voting for the legislation which became Public Law 88-6 bestowing honorary U.S. citizenship on Sir Winston. I said at that time and I repeat now: It was a great privilege in behalf of a great man.

Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston's passing was the subject of an editorial eulogy published this morning by the Democrat and Chronicle of Rochester, N.Y. I take pleasure in sharing this eloquent expression with my colleagues:

A GIANT PASSES

So the old gentleman died, and the very fact of his death, even as the achievements of his life, had the quality of perfect timing.

For Sir Winston Churchill's death reminds us—at a time when the free world needs reminding—that nations can rise above bickering and name calling and apathy; that there is a nobility and a willingness to sacrifice in mankind, when the right figure steps forth to lead.

His death reminds us of the days and months and years that his shattered stubborn little island stood against the might of organized barbarism—we called it the Axis then—and held it at bay until the rest of the free world could mobilize to join the fight. So we are reminded that while one oasis of freedom remains, there is always hope for man.

His death reminds us that the price of war always is too great, for victor as well as vanquished. This practical thought should cause the free world to look up from its mourning and renew its dedication to peace. For in ultimate victory, the British nation

overspent its strength in the cause of honor and freedom in that last great war. After the war it entered upon the twilight of greatness, but it did this without a whimper, knowing it had done what had to be done.

His death reminds us always to seek for giants, of whom we have so pitifully few today. We need giants who can see—as did Sir Winston—danger massing against the free world when others cannot see it; who can describe the danger with icy or fiery words; and who can thus arouse free men to action.

We need to think of all those things now, we who live in this bickering threatening world. And the death of the old gentleman reminds us to think hard, even while we mourn.

Mr. Speaker, in this same edition, the editors of the Democrat and Chronicle carried an article by Reporter George Murphy which traced the little-known ancestry aspects of Sir Winston that so directly relate to Rochester, N.Y. All who are interested in this history, I am sure will find Mr. Murphy's article a fascinating story:

COOWNER OF DEMOCRAT AND CHRONICLE PROPRIETOR—CHURCHILL'S GRANDFATHER WAS ROCHESTERIAN

(By George Murphy)

Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, who typified England and the English people, had Yankee blood in his veins.

His maternal grandfather, Leonard Jerome, once lived only a stone's throw from where this story is written—74 Fitzhugh Street South, now the site of the Civic Center Garage.

As a matter of fact, the connection between Britain's great leader and this newspaper is more than geographic, for Leonard Jerome and his brother Lawrence owned the Rochester Daily American from 1846 to 1850, and that newspaper eventually was combined with the Democrat and in 1870 became an integral part of the Democrat and Chronicle.

It was prophetic that Churchill's grandfather once dealt with the printed word, for it was Winston who rallied Britain when she stood alone in World War II with these historic words:

"We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets; we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender."

One wonders also if Winston Churchill did not inherit his audacity, his gusto, and his gift for the stirring phrase from ancestors who were pioneers in upstate New York.

His grandfather was born on a farm at Pompey, south of Syracuse. Young Leonard was sent as a lad in his teens to live with his uncle, Hiram K. Jerome, a lawyer in Palmyra. There he prepared for college, leaving for Princeton in 1836, but a desire to economize prompted him to transfer 2 years later to Union College in Schenectady, where he was graduated in 1839.

Returning to Palmyra, he studied law in the office of his uncle, recently named judge of Wayne County. And when Judge Jerome decided in 1842 to move to Rochester, Leonard and his younger brother, Lawrence likewise moved to the Flour City.

The Jeromes located in the fashionable third ward where the judge rented a house at No. 72 (later renumbered 83) Fitzhugh Street South, while his two nephews boarded across the street at No. 63 (later 74). Neither Leonard nor his brother developed a strong attachment to law, and in 1845, after Lawrence married Catherine Hall, a wealthy heiress of Palmyra, the brothers bought an interest in the Daily American.

Shortly after their marriage in August 1844, Lawrence and his wife rented the Pond House

at No. 65 South Sophia (No. 219 Plymouth) Street, taking Leonard in as a boarder, but they moved back to 63 South Fitzhugh the next year, renting the entire house.

Leonard settled there with his wife, too, when in April 1849 he married Clarissa Hall, younger sister of Lawrence's Catherine. It must have been a lively household, but the spacious house afforded ample room for the two Jerome-Hall couples.

The first two sons of Lawrence and Catherine Jerome, Roswell W. and Lovell Hall, were born in the house at 63 South Fitzhugh Street S. but Jennie Jerome (Churchill's mother) and one of Leonard and Clarissa's four daughters was not.

But local myths have waxed with the Churchill fame until finally some Rochesterians were insisting that this city was the birthplace of the statesman's mother.

Lady Churchill, who should know, wrote in her autobiography, "I was born in Brooklyn." But her son, ever the politician, at times seemed to concur in the Rochester claim while not denying Brooklyn's.

In 1941 when Winston received—via radio—an honorary degree from the University of Rochester, he replied to the honor in these diplomatic words:

"As you tell me, my mother was born in Rochester."

In 1952 City Historian Blake McKelvey's passion for historical accuracy swept away the cobwebs spun by local wishful thinking. His careful research showed that Jennie Jerome was born in Brooklyn 4 years after her parents moved away from Rochester and the Fitzhugh Street house.

A bronze tablet which once stood on that house told the true story in its inscription:

"Leonard Jerome, publisher and grandfather of Britain's Winston Churchill resided on this site, 1844-50. He married Clarissa Hall of Palmyra, April 5, 1849."

Winston Churchill visited Rochester on two occasions. He came the first time as a young Boer War correspondent to address a sparse audience in the Lyceum Theater on January 28, 1901. Winston Churchill was not a celebrated name then.

He was better known on his second visit, February 10, 1932, when he spoke on "The World Economic Crisis" at the Eastman Theater. But the Labor Party was in power in Britain and Winston was on the sidelines, picking up a few dollars on a lecture tour.

On neither visit is there any record he visited the houses where his forebears had dwelt.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to share with the Members of the House a historical account of the Churchill ancestry which was printed a few days ago in the Palmyra Courier-Journal which serves a large part of my Wayne County constituency. Editor Carol Clark and her staff have provided us with details of the special relationship which the community of Palmyra had in the life of Leonard Jerome, Sir Winston's maternal grandfather:

WINSTON CHURCHILL—WE CLAIM ONE "FINEST HOUR"

Winston Churchill, citizen of the world, the United States only honorary citizen, of early Palmyra stock—Palmyra can claim him as a son, a part of our vital heritage.

Churchill never formally recognized Palmyra's claim to his birthright through his maternal grandparents here. We are among the many who entered his bloodline—Marion, Rochester, New York City, Philadelphia, New England.

A blood-right Churchill did claim. Of his address to our Congress in December, 1941 he wrote, "To me, who could trace unbroken male descent on my mother's side through five generations from a lieutenant who served

in George Washington's army, it was possible to feel a blood-right to speak to the representatives of the great Republic in our common cause."

That Christmas Eve Churchill had told the American people, "I cannot truthfully say that I feel far from home. Whether it be the ties of blood on my mother's side, or the friendships I have developed here over the many years of active life, or the commanding sentiment of comradeship in the common cause of great peoples, I have a right to sit at your fireside."

Palmyra was 2 years in the making when in 1791 Rhode Islander David Wilcox joined the settlement. A daughter, Clarissa, in the early 1820's, wed Ambrose Hall, newly come from Massachusetts, and raised a family of six daughters in their home where the village park bandstand now stands.

Their daughter, also Clarissa, married Leonard Jerome, a prosperous Marion farmer formerly of Pompey in Onondaga County.

The Jeromes moved to Rochester, then to New York, where Leonard became a publisher, arts' patron, racetrack owner, diplomat, world traveler, a man of wealth.

A daughter, one of four, Jenny Jerome, married Englishman Lord Randolph Churchill.

Ninety years ago a son was born to the granddaughter of Ambrose Hall and the son of the Duke of Marlborough.

He was named Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill.

The Jerome farm still stands on the Boss Road in Marion, now the home of the Leo Allen family.

Still standing on west Canal Street is the home of newlywed Leonard and Clarissa Hall Jerome.

And, still remembered is the Market Street site of the law office where Leonard Jerome studied law with an uncle, Judge Hiram Jerome.

Whatever strain of pioneer spirit that typified the industry of the early Palmyra coursed through the generations to Winston Churchill, however small the part a Palmyra ancestry played in his formation, of the preponderance of greatness that has marked Churchill's 90 years, Palmyra can rightly claim at least one of his finest hours.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, my good constituents from the Fifth District of Texas will think me remiss in my duty if I do not express in their behalf that we of Dallas County join with those in this august body and those of the world who have expressed their deepest sorrow at the passing of one of the century's ablest leaders and statesmen, Sir Winston Churchill. Particularly, representing Dallas, do I feel motivated to speak out in praise of this man's life and in sorrow at this man's death, for we in Dallas owe him a debt. Three years ago, while I was the mayor of the fine city of Dallas, Sir Winston was made an honorary citizen of Dallas. In responding to this city's tribute to him, Sir Winston paid Dallas one of its most revered compliments. We will never forget this great man or his warm remarks about our city.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, most of us, in this body of Members truly representative of our Nation, are of that generation which President Kennedy in his inaugural address referred to as "tempered by war." We had, from the tragic years from 1938 to the triumphant year of 1945, our own great leader in the person of Franklin D. Roosevelt, but we and all people who fought tyranny during that dark convulsion which shook the earth had another leader in the person of Sir Winston Churchill.

England has the honor to call him her own, but we have the honor to call him ours, too, by adoption and by affection. From the beginning of that conflict there was tragedy, and there was fear, and a new language was imposed upon the minds and hearts of the American people. As the German armies overran Poland, the first nation proud enough to fight rather than surrender, the words "blitzkrieg," "panzer," "stuka," and "gestapo" became household words, and brought a foreboding of a terrible and irresistible force which could menace us even across the Atlantic, and as those armies overran France this fear increased.

And then that doughty, cocky, magnificent voice was raised, and a more familiar language went to work, and phrase after eloquent phrase rolled across England, and across America, and put heart in her people and our own.

"Give us the tools," he said, and America produced the tools.

"Look west, the land is also bright," he quoted, and the conscience and honor of America were awakened.

"We shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender," he said, and courage and resolve flowed from this one man into all who enlisted in the cause of freedom.

For that generation which was tempered by war, he provided both the fire and the steel; he articulated courage and honor; he brought out the best in all of us, and made that generation greater than it had been.

For all those, in all lands, who have ever engaged in public service, he did something more. He demonstrated the value of standing hard by one's beliefs. Sir Winston Churchill did not always leap mightily from triumph to triumph. He had his political defeats, his public repudiations, and must at times have despaired for the future of all those principles in which he most deeply believed, but he held to those principles and in the fullness of time they were recognized, needed, and used to save his nation and our own.

Not many men live to be recognized as great in their own time. None will be recognized as greater in our own. Warrior, statesman, author, artist—this was a man. This was the titan of our time. From his life each of us has gained greatly; with his death we join gratefully to do him honor.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sorrow on the passing of a great statesman and great citizen, Winston Churchill. When Congress made this noble Englishman an honorary citizen of the United States, it was showing this country's deep affection for him, its abiding admiration. In effect, Congress said, "We are presenting you with the finest gift in our power to give, because of your outstanding foresight, your invincible courage, your inspired leadership to the free world in some of its darkest hours."

We are today honoring him in death, but fortunately he did not have to wait

for the many honors and the respect his colleagues in Great Britain, and Americans everywhere accorded him during his life. Respected and long recognized for his distinguished leadership and for upholding the highest standards of public office, he was equally esteemed for his personal graces and his exceptional concern for all mankind.

Winston Churchill has left a distinguished imprint upon the decisions and policies of our time. We shall all miss his greatness, his wisdom, his counsel and the courage with which he held steadfastly to his convictions.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, all too often it seems that the true worth of a man is recognized only after his death. This was not true of our beloved Winston Churchill.

This man became a legend in his own time. He became the symbol of a proud people and a proud nation and an enduring, pridelike relationship between our great Nation and his own. The extent of his personal contribution to the world is simply awe inspiring—virtually impossible to measure in any mortal terms. His passing takes Winston Churchill into the realm of the immortal, but to so many of us he has seemed immortal while he was among us.

Winston Churchill has always seemed to me to be a man who defies description in any reasonably human terms. His contributions have been so extensive, so valuable, so fulfilling that he demands description in language that is too poetic because despite the immortal character of the man, he was a warm, sincere, and genuine human. He enjoyed his life and he obviously enjoyed life's pleasures, even though he had dedicated his life to service to his fellow man. And, there is no man in public life in any time who has so richly deserved the deference he received during his lifetime and now. His greatness found its origins in his own character and he was one of the few men on this earth who has been able, by the great force of his magnetic ability, to influence people and nations and the world.

He has seemed, in recent years, to gain in stature and in the admiration of his colleagues, friends, and admirers and in human warmth. It has become evident to every citizen of every nation that Winston Churchill had given his every thought, his every action, and his life to the best interests of Britain and the world. The affection that has been showered on him in recent years seemed to please him and I am very deeply grateful that this man who gave so much was able to know—as one of our great leaders was never able to know—that the people loved him.

It has become commonplace in recent times for men in public life to talk about their place in history. Winston Churchill who himself has gained a hall-mark reputation as an historian will be recorded in history as the man who perhaps best represents the Western World's image of leadership in modern times. The symbol of leadership that he is leaving behind may never again be matched on this earth. His mastery of men and events and issues was not only uncom-

mon—it was gigantic. His own people have recognized him as a superb author, orator, patriot. Here in the United States we have known him for all these things and as a friend.

I am personally very deeply sorry that he is no longer with us, and yet I know that he will live forever in the hearts of his own people, on the pages of history, and in our hearts.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, freedom-loving people the world over today mourn the death of Sir Winston Churchill. The great warrior is stilled. The final battle is over.

But the tears in our eyes and the grief in our hearts are not so much for Sir Winston, himself, who lived a rich, full life and tasted the fruits of honor and glory and the respect and admiration of his fellow man.

No, I think we mourn for ourselves, for we have lost a valiant and farsighted man. We have lost a statesman and a patriot who rallied an entire country to the cause of liberty, giving it the fortitude and courage to withstand the forces of oppression and tyranny which besieged it. We have witnessed the passing of a leader who helped inspire an alliance of nations to turn back the enemy so that freedom might prevail. We have lost a great orator and writer who gave the English language new eloquence. Indeed, we mourn for ourselves because we have lost one of the great men of our time.

Yet, we cannot really mourn for our children who will never know him as we did. We cannot grieve for them because they are the richer because Sir Winston lived. They are the heirs of the liberty into which he breathed new life and the heirs of the freedom he fought so steadfastly to perpetuate.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we have received the tragic though not unexpected news of the passing of the truly remarkable Sir Winston. His great works will live forever in the history of our planet as shining guideposts for those who follow.

Mere words fail as we seek to eulogize Winston Spencer Churchill. The greatest of the great falls far short of the mark in describing the impact of this man upon our century. It is clear to all that he was the greatest of our era—and one of only a few of the truly outstanding mortals in all of recorded history.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware that Sir Winston was a man of many rare qualities. He leaves a rich personal heritage which we may study to our very great benefit.

His statesmanship is legendary. By the force of his own personality and will, Prime Minister Churchill crystallized the determination of his own nation and of the entire free world during times of extreme danger to repel and overcome the most serious threat to civilized society in the history of the world to that point. It seems probable that this "uncommon commoner" affected the course of human affairs more profoundly than has any other single individual since Jesus of Nazareth.

Mr. Churchill was an early and implacable foe of communism, recognizing it as a most dangerous form of tyranny.

As a member of the House of Commons for 62 of his 90 years, Mr. Churchill was a parliamentarian without equal—a politician in the most honorable sense of the word.

Mr. Churchill was perhaps the foremost craftsman of the English language of all time—written and oral, formal and extemporaneous—a towering figure in the area of human expression.

Mr. Churchill was a renowned painter throughout most of his life—one of the outstanding artists of his time. His place in history would have been secure with his contributions in this field alone.

As the son of an American mother, and an honorary citizen of the United States—a distinction of which he was enormously proud—we cherish Mr. Churchill as one of our own.

It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that we might honor the great Sir Winston best—and simultaneously benefit all of mankind—by studying his life, emulating his works as best we can, heeding his admonitions, pursuing his dreams, and keeping alive his ideas.

May God grant us a small portion of his indomitable courage, his profound foresight, his selfless, sustained dedication to the preservation of freedom for all men.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, belief in evil equals fear. Belief in good equals courage. Sir Winston Churchill's death reminds us of these truths. He was in fact the world's greatest living person and his passing over to the realm of spirit makes us look again at his predominant tool for leadership and victory—namely, courage. Even the most humble are important in the eyes of God; and we Christians believe that all become great with the acquisition and practice of courage for right things. Churchill's life will always be a symbol of the value of courage for proper objectives. I am glad I lived in his age, met him, and have his memory to strengthen me. As to his life we all respond "Well done."

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston Churchill is dead. And it is right and proper for all who love freedom and admire man to do him honor.

But it must be done in the correct way. It is not enough merely to recite lists of deeds done, or name battles won, or chant a string of adjectives with his name. Nor should it be maudlin or idolatrous.

He would not have liked it.

More important, it would have missed the point. For Churchill was a man, and a very human one. He made mistakes, sometimes enormous. He was hard to get along with, and sometimes pettish. He was always stubborn, and he could be tyrannical.

But it was precisely that humanity—set in a grand scale and raised to a high power—that made him what he was: One of the giants of our times. Churchill, the man, was bigger than lifesize, and it was partly through this that he led men as he did. But he led men from a position in their midst, rather than trying to lead from above. He went out into the streets during the agony of London, to

be with his people. As a man, then, we must see him and do praise to his measure.

Merely to have lived in the same century with Sir Winston was an honor and an inspiration and, unquestionably, fun. For Churchill had that lashing sense of humor and quick flash of wit which importantly complemented his iron will and fierce resolve. He was big enough and strong enough to direct it against himself, as well as others.

His wit, coupled with his impatience, helped him lead. "Pray submit to me, by 4 p.m. today, on one-half sheet of paper, the preparations undertaken by His Majesty's Navy to pursue the coming war," he supposedly wrote the First Sea Lord after becoming the First Lord of the Admiralty.

He led with words, written sometimes but more effectively spoken. To an extraordinary degree, his language had always expressed his unusual character. It came, in time, to express not only what Great Britain must be, but what the Western World must do. It was good, tough language and it had a majesty that made the important things seem vitally alive and immediate. He could never say, as had his predecessor, Neville Chamberlain, that England would not fight "for a small, faraway country, between people of whom we know nothing."

Instead, Churchill rallied his people and the world to the struggle at hand and to the problems to come. He did so by combining to a degree unmatched since President Lincoln, the qualities of a great man and a towering writer in a setting of dark peril. The result was the true criterion of leadership; he made people feel directly, personally, and passionately involved in the great events of their time. Not only people in Great Britain, but also in France, America, and around the world.

Winston Churchill did this himself, through the force of his personality and the power of his words. The setting did not make the man, though it called him forth. Once emerged, he changed it entirely. His life was one of the rarest of all historical events; in living, he did not make a difference. He made the difference.

His death was right and proper. It was expected and dignified, quiet and fitting, after such a life. His going leaves us all the poorer, as his living left us all the richer.

Winston Churchill will always be with us, for in large measure he molded our world. He will particularly be in our hearts during moments of crisis and fear, his words and his example giving fiery thrust to our hopes:

In war, resolution.
In defeat, defiance.
In victory, magnanimity.
In peace, good will.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of my service in the Congress was a visit with Sir Winston Churchill at 10 Downing Street in London in the fall of 1951. Mr. Churchill was again Prime Minister following Prime Minister Attlee and his labor government. I was

with a group of my colleagues headed by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

As our congressional group was leaving Mr. Churchill's office, the Prime Minister called me back to inquire of his good friend, Jimmy Byrnes. The Prime Minister was very familiar with the history of our country and he knew of my States rights philosophy and devotion to the private enterprise system. Mr. Churchill with tears in his eyes said that England could no longer lead the free world and this responsibility now belonged to the United States. He said that England could become a second-rate power due largely to one party in England being wholly conservative and the other extremely liberal. Mr. Churchill said that after 6 years of the labor government under Mr. Attlee, he could do nothing to undo socialistic measures which had been instituted by the labor government. Churchill said it was impossible to induce businessmen to return and take over certain utilities that had been nationalized by the Government because these businessmen knew that someday the liberal government would come back to power and that business would be again nationalized.

Mr. Churchill, in referring to socialized medicine, said that it would be impossible for him to take a pair of pliers and pull the teeth from the mouths of the people given to them by the Government. He said they would howl to high heaven. He used this as an example to illustrate that there is no turning back from socialism and the erosion of initiative, private enterprise, and individual effort.

Mr. Churchill suggested that if the United States were to remain the heart and core of the free world, our two great political parties must continue to embody in each conservatives, liberals, and moderates. He warned that the United States would deteriorate and lose its prestige and position as a world power if one of our great political parties became completely conservative and the other totally liberal. Sooner or later, Mr. Churchill warned, the liberal party would come to power and the United States and its great institutions would be treated to socialistic schemes from which there is no return. Mr. Churchill said in order for the United States to continue its world leadership it would be necessary to keep a balance in both political parties so that the Nation could move forward in the middle of the road. I was amazed at Mr. Churchill's keen insight into American political philosophy and was amazed with his foresight. I will always believe that Mr. Churchill called me aside for this word of warning because at that time I was a young man in my early thirties, and he knew that I was associated with the philosophy of States rights and devoted to the private enterprise system and was a member of the Democratic Party which has traditionally encompassed all elements and classes of our American society.

Mr. Speaker, I have wished many times that the world had listened to Winston Churchill, a man of unsurpassed wisdom, culture, education,

training, and experience in world leadership in the most critical time in our modern history. No one was more aware than Winston Churchill that the Polish corridor created after World War I was the immediate cause of World War II. Churchill was well aware that a Berlin corridor would set the stage for World War III. It will always remain a mystery to me how the incredible tragedy of the Berlin corridor was fostered on the world. War lords and agitators in their wildest imagination could have never dreamed up a more perfect way to insure another war. Winston Churchill knew, which many of us seem to forget, that Communist Russia was equally as guilty as Adolph Hitler in launching World War II. He kept constantly in mind that Communist Russia violated the integrity of Poland and invaded that nation and in its deal with Hitler received the largest slice of Polish territory.

Churchill was one of the greatest men in the history of the world but he did not have to be great to see the folly and stark tragedy of turning Central Europe over to Communist Russia. Churchill knew in the end that we won no victory in Europe. We only made it possible for Communist Russia to win the ultimate victory. It was with such sadness that Churchill saw Poland, the very nation that the free nations went to war to preserve, gobbled up by the ruthless Communist aggressor, thus depriving the Western World of a victory over the forces of oppression, dictatorship, and aggression.

Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill typified all that was great, all that was grand, gallant, and magnificent about the British Empire. Winston Churchill is an example of British statesmanship at its best. Churchill was incomparable as a patriot, soldier, historian, and statesman. We are all indebted to him today for standing like a stone wall guarding the ramparts of freedom when the chips were down.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 136

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has learned with profound sorrow of the death of Sir Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, honorary citizen of the United States, beloved elder statesman of the world.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives tenders its deep sympathy to the members of the family of the late Sir Winston Churchill, and to his countrymen, and expresses the hope that the burden of their personal loss will be diminished by the knowledge that it is shared by his fellow citizens on this side of the Atlantic who were sustained by his eloquent words and courageous deeds when lesser men despaired and by all those throughout the world who are the beneficiaries of his dauntless defense of freedom.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to communicate these expressions of sentiment to the family of the deceased and to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Sir Winston Churchill the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 26, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

407. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Agency's reply to report (B-146754) on deficiencies in administration of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile; to the Committee on Government Operations.

408. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting proceedings of the 66th National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 61); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and printed with illustrations.

409. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of the Rural Electrification Administration for fiscal year 1964; to the Committee on Agriculture.

410. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting an annual report of the orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, by the Secretary, dated December 1964, pursuant to section 201(b), Public Law 84-540; to the Committee on Agriculture.

411. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

412. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the July-November 1964 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

413. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on insured shipments to Yugoslavia for the month of December 1964, pursuant to title III, Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

414. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report on disposition of foreign excess property during fiscal year 1964, pursuant to provisions of title IV, Foreign Excess Property, Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (sec. 404, 63 Stat. 398; 40 U.S.C. 514); to the Committee on Government Operations.

415. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property

and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

416. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the deficient financial analysis which resulted in approval of unneeded grant, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

417. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on unreasonably high prices paid by Government prime contractors and subcontractors for GG-49 gyroscopes purchased from the only qualified and approved source, Honeywell, Inc., Aeronautical Division, Minneapolis, Minn., Department of Defense and National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

418. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive Federal matching of administrative expenses for public assistance programs in the State of Massachusetts, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

419. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on potential savings by consolidating additional personnel offices of field stations, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

420. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of "All Electric Homes in the United States, 1964"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

421. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

422. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to withdraw from the district courts jurisdiction of suits brought by fiduciaries who have been appointed for the purpose of creating diversity of citizenship between the parties"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

423. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a report of court's opinion *In re Josephine C. Rumley, Administratrix of the Estate of George S. Rumley v. The United States*, Congressional No. 4-61; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

424. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting information relative to the total number of positions in grades GS-17 and GS-18 required to be reported pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1105a; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 3347. A bill to repeal the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3348. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 3349. A bill for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 3350. A bill to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 3351. A bill to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3352. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3353. A bill to correct and improve the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 3354. A bill to provide benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such benefits are provided for other members of the Armed Forces and their survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3355. A bill to provide that nonprofit hospitals shall be subject to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3356. A bill to provide for the erection of a monument on Alcatraz Island to commemorate the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, Calif., in 1945, and to serve as a symbol of peace; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 3357. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3358. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for certain dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age or disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3359. A bill to encourage the use of private benefit plans in lieu of social security by providing that individuals who are eligible for certain benefits under such plans shall not be entitled to social security benefits or subject to social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3360. A bill to amend titles I, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act to make individuals suffering from tuberculosis or mental illness eligible thereunder for public assistance payments (and medical assistance) on the same basis as individuals suffering from other types of illness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (by request):

H.R. 3361. A bill to provide for payment for hospital and related health services for persons 65 years of age and older, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 3362. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3363. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide uniforms for mail handlers in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3364. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 3365. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 3366. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 3367. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional \$2,400 exemption from income tax for certain amounts received as retirement annuities or pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 3369. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3370. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources, to remove certain restrictions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 3371. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3372. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3373. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 3374. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3375. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3376. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3377. A bill to increase, in the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years of age until which child's insurance benefits may be received under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 3378. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies and their auxiliaries the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 3379. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, Califor-

nia, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 3380. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1958 to authorize reimbursement to Frankenmuth, Mich., for certain work on the flood control project on the Saginaw River, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 3381. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 3382. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on photographic equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 3383. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3384. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 3385. A bill to provide a uniform period for daylight saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3386. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b), of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3387. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3388. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 3389. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to assist in compensating for the hazardous and arduous nature of employment in certain occupations, and for the decreased life expectancy of persons engaged in such occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 3390. A bill to appropriate funds for advanced engineering, design, and initiation of construction of the New Hope Reservoir project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 3391. A bill to appropriate funds for construction of the navigation project at Wilmington Harbor, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 3392. A bill to appropriate funds for construction of the North Masonboro Inlet Jetty, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 3393. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3394. A bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physi-

cal abuse of children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 3395. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 3396. A bill to extend veteran benefits to persons serving in the Armed Forces between November 12, 1918 and July 2, 1921; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 3397. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit or repeal certain retailers excise taxes and to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of payments under retirement plans of certain exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 3401. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for real property taxes not collected on real property owned by a foreign government and therefore exempt from taxation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 3402. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 3403. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing annuities for persons who participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, by extending the class to whom annuities may be paid; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 3404. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturer's excise tax on household-type electric, gas, and oil appliances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 3406. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 3407. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of \$100 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a \$2,400 and \$3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 percent where the veteran served overseas during World War I, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3408. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a 6-year presumption of service connection of tuberculous disease in the case of former prisoners of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 3409. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 3410. A bill to repeal retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 3411. A bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 3412. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies", approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3413. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that individuals who incur a disability in line of duty during certain service shall be entitled to certain veteran's benefits; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3414. A bill to provide that hereafter the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among career officers or employees of such Bureau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 3415. A bill to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 3416. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3417. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 3418. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code (relating to highways) in order to authorize appropriations to assist the States in the purchase of lands and easements for scenic purposes along Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3419. A bill to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3420. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3421. A bill to provide for equitable acquisition practices, fair compensation, and effective relocation assistance in real property acquisitions for Federal and federally assisted programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3422. A bill to provide that until the national debt is retired, not less than 10 percent of the net budget receipts of the United States for each fiscal year shall be utilized solely for reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3423. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit charitable contributions, bequests, transfers, and gifts to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) to be deductible for income tax,

estate tax, and gift tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3424. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3425. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3426. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to place social security coverage on an individual option basis for U.S. citizens performing service in the United States as employees of international organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3427. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent or surviving sisters of certain insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3428. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to any live dramatic (including musical) performance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3430. A bill relating to the tax treatment of transfers of rights to copyrights and literary, musical, and artistic compositions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3431. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 3432. A bill to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 3433. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall convey certain real property to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 3434. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 3435. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture jointly with the Secretary of Commerce to make a preliminary survey of the proposed Skyline Drive Recreation Way in the Manti-LaSal and Fishlake National Forests in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 3438. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 3439. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3440. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 3441. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3442. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 3443. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3444. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 3445. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 3446. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3447. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 3448. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 3449. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 3450. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 3451. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 3452. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.R. 3453. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 3454. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 3455. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 3456. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 3457. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3458. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 3459. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3460. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 3461. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 3462. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 3463. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 3464. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUOT:

H.R. 3465. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 3466. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 3467. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 3468. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3469. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 3470. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 3471. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 3472. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 3473. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 3474. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3475. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3476. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 3477. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 3478. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 3479. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3480. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 3481. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 3482. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3483. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 3484. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 3485. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 3486. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 3487. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 3488. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 3489. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 3490. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 3491. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 3492. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 3493. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 3494. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 3495. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 222. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.J. Res. 223. Joint resolution providing that an environmental health center that may hereafter be established in the Public Health Service shall be known as "Rachel Carson Memorial Research Center for Environmental Health"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 224. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 225. Joint resolution establishing a section to be known as the Shevchenko Freedom Library in the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.
H.J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to provide for the creation of a captive nations freedom series of postage stamps in honor of national

heroes of freedom, commencing with a Taras Shevchenko freedom stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 227. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to designate Columbus Day, the 12th day of October in each year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.J. Res. 229. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week of November 16 to 22 as National Student Council Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.J. Res. 230. Joint resolution designating the bridge constructed over the Washington Channel of the Potomac River in the District of Columbia, as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the centennial anniversary, on April 9, 1965, of the surrender of General Lee to General Grant at Appomattox, Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.J. Res. 232. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 233. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United Arab Republic be denied aid under the terms of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution to establish an international economic conference to consider balance of payments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and calling upon the Soviet Union to guarantee human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the rectification of the relief rolls of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposal to close the Sunmount Veterans' Administration Hospital, Tupper Lake, N.Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the enforcement of the provisions of article 19 of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TODD:

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 137. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 80; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H. Res. 138. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 139. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3436. A bill to provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in the State of Arizona to establish actual permanent residence; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 3437. A bill to provide for the advancement of Hospitalman Chief Gerald Henry White, U.S. Navy (retired), to the grade of chief warrant pharmacist; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 3496. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yoshio Watanabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Anne Marie Kee Tham Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 3498. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite Kedemos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mala Swe Bridges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 3500. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3501. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Leahy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 3502. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephina C. Aquino Heindel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3503. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marianna Fiannaca Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3504. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivas Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3505. A bill for the relief of Beverly Helen (Smith) Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3506. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joan Bramwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 3507. A bill for the relief of Dr. Selim Samaan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3508. A bill for the relief of Florinda Cascarano and Lucia Pacucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3509. A bill for the relief of Santa Pisciotto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3510. A bill for the relief of Nicola Congiliario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3511. A bill for the relief of Newton Dowden and Shirley Agnes Dowden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3512. A bill for the relief of Angelo Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3513. A bill for the relief of Angelo Lopane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3514. A bill for the relief of Zakharla Dorani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 3515. A bill for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3516. A bill for the relief of John (Ioannis) Antonopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3517. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Pito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3518. A bill for the relief of Efthymios Chrysoskios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3519. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3520. A bill for the relief of Dr. Themistocles J. Chrysoschoos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3521. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Iccari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 3522. A bill for the relief of Ng Thlat Hor and Ng Thlat Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3523. A bill for the relief of Carmela Macaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3524. A bill for the relief of Dr. Aman Farajani and his wife, Letitia Atienza Farajani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3525. A bill for the relief of Leon Levy, Mira Levy, and Moses Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3526. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eric J. Lazaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 3527. A bill for the relief of Manuel Lee Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3528. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Esposito and Eduardo Amodio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 3529. A bill for the relief of Claire A. Zarur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3530. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3531. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Cesar Muniz y Sotolongo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 3532. A bill for the relief of Vlada Cizerlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3533. A bill for the relief of Todor Dimovski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 3534. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael F. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 3535. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Viola Louise Bradley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 3536. A bill for the relief of George R. Lore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3537. A bill for the relief of Albert Carter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3538. A bill for the relief of Soultana Tselidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3539. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sadashiv V. Phansalkar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3540. A bill for the relief of Enni Rosa-Tezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 3541. A bill for the relief of Leena Johanna Jaskari Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Alabama:

H.R. 3542. A bill for the relief of Elko Udaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:
H.R. 3543. A bill for the relief of Kyriakos G. Kyriakoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:
H.R. 3544. A bill for the relief of Janina Janus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:
H.R. 3545. A bill for the relief of Lauren F. Teutsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:
H.R. 3546. A bill for the relief of Owen C. Boyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3547. A bill for the relief of Dusan Dobnik, Anna Dobnik, and Verena Dobnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:
H.R. 3548. A bill for the relief of Carmen Elsen and Clarence Rudolph Chase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3549. A bill for the relief of Spyros Katsihitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3550. A bill for the relief of Biagio Polizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3551. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Janet Franklin (nee Reid); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:
H.R. 3552. A bill for the relief of Colombo Melone, his wife, Vivalda Melone, and his minor child, Maria Teresa Melone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:
H.R. 3553. A bill for the relief of Andrija Horwath, his wife, Anka Horwath, his son, Adolfo Horwath, his mother, Elisabeta Horwath, and his sister-in-law, Elisabeta Horwath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:
H.R. 3554. A bill for the relief of Eva Cuaycong deCastro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:
H.R. 3555. A bill for the relief of Njeh Megerdichian and his wife, Mary Megerdichian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3556. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chieko Takagi McKinstry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:
H.R. 3557. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:
H.R. 3558. A bill for the relief of Jean Croitorou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3559. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angel Virgin Papas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3560. A bill for the relief of Michael Tsimenoglou and his wife, Arety Tsimenoglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3561. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Soon Man Rhim (nee Hal Won Chang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3562. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yolanda Asuncion Chia de Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:
H.R. 3563. A bill for the relief of Aristotelis G. Papaevangelou and Constantina Papaevangelou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:
H.R. 3564. A bill for the relief of Anita Roberta Facey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3565. A bill for the relief of Viviane Rubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:
H.R. 3566. A bill for the relief of Crystal Julia Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:
H.R. 3567. A bill for the relief of Ziya Idris Tabak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3568. A bill for the relief of Jivan R. Tabibian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:
H.R. 3569. A bill for the relief of Odette M. Hudspeth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:
H.R. 3570. A bill for the relief of Dr. Surender Kumar Nanda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALBAUM:
H.R. 3571. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Ioannis Tsakiris (husband), Thomae Dimitrios Tsakiris (wife); and two children, Ioannis and Athina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:
H.R. 3572. A bill for the relief of Paja Radojevic and his wife Zlata Radojevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3573. A bill for the relief of Miloye M. Sokitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TODD:
H.R. 3574. A bill for the relief of Hack Kyun Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:
H.R. 3575. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kaloo Chandiram Thadhani and his wife, Rekha Thadhani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

79. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive director, National Affairs Committee, Youth Council on Civic Affairs, Inc. Jacksonville, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting consideration of legislation to charter the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, a national organization composed of local community youth councils; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

80. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to passage of the Federal Reserve reform bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ukrainian Independence Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to join my colleagues in rising today to salute and remember January 22, 1918—the date the Ukrainian peoples proclaimed the now-destroyed Ukrainian National Republic. That was 47 years ago. A lot has happened to the world order in this period of time, but we are concerned here today with just two events that have touched the lives of the Ukrainian people. Just 3 years after independence was proclaimed the country was occupied by Soviet troops, and 12 years after that, in 1933, the once-free peoples of the Ukraine were incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, being a political pragmatist and not a historical fatalist, I realize, as do many of my colleagues in both Houses, that all the speeches, all the salutes, and all the remembrances

will not change the policies of the Soviet leaders, or undo this tragedy of modern history. There are, however, valid reasons for our words today:

First of all, it permits us the opportunity to search our own souls and political consciences, by taking just a few moments each year to recall the history of these noble peoples. In what better forum can this be done than in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress? Secondly, it affords the American people the opportunity to collectively recall there still exists in the world national and religious persecution. Thirdly, it gives us the chance to tell the world that we Americans do not take our freedoms lightly or for granted. Despite impressions to the contrary, the American people are not complacent, are not preoccupied with themselves. Instead, our hearts and our minds and our spirit will always be with those less fortunate than ourselves—especially with those whose freedom has been forcibly taken from them.

Let us tell Ukrainians all over the world today that we heartily agree with President Johnson who said in his inaugural address:

How incredible it is that in this fragile existence we should hate and destroy one

another. There are possibilities enough for all who will abandon mastery over others to pursue mastery over nature. There is world enough for all to seek their happiness in their own way.

Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the acts of the 88th Congress was to confer honorary citizenship on Sir Winston S. Churchill. We did so in recognition of the vast and heroic part that he played in the prosecution of the allied war effort which gave us victory over our common foes, the Axis Powers. We did it also because he exemplified more than any other living mortal of foreign nationality those essential traits of devotion to liberty on which the whole American experiment was initially founded. The fact that this experiment,

begun 189 years ago, has not only endured but flourished and prospered beyond measure is due in large part to the fact that these ideals of liberty, respect for truth, and love of justice, have been fought for by courageous men of purpose and vision.

Sir Winston Churchill will surely live forever in the annals of history. We mourn today his passing; yet, we rejoice in the imperishable heritage which he has not only helped to preserve but which his shining deeds and magnificent words of courageous counsel in times of adversity have helped to strengthen. For in the course of human events there will surely come other times of decision; yes, even times when once again our whole democratic system will come under the siege guns of those who would overcome us. Yet, we can remain confident that in times like these the inspiration of Sir Winston Churchill's life and writings will continue to strengthen other men in the purpose and resolve to resist tyranny and remain free. The world has truly lost a great man, but as freedom's champion he lives on in the immortal garb of historic greatness. He will forever remain joined in the affections of the American people with the great patriots of our Republic.

Polish Insurrection of 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the unhappy Poles have suffered under numerous alien regimes, but they suffered longer and more cruelly under the oppressive and decrepit regime of Russian czars than any of the others. Since the third partition of Poland late in the 18th century, most of Poland became part of imperial Russia and the majority of the Polish nation restive subjects of the czars. More than once, the Polish people tried to free themselves through uprisings and open revolts. Such an event took place in 1863.

This uprising was proclaimed on January 22 of that year, but actually it had been in the making since mid-1861. A secret conspiracy was planned, with adherents in all parts of Poland, in August of 1861. On October 15, there was a demonstration protest. Demonstrators took possession of the churches, and the clergy was forced to close them down. This was followed by reconciliation overtures by Russian authorities, and for a while things seemed quiet. Then in the summer of 1862 more uprisings took place; there was an attempt to assassinate the Russian Grand Duke. This was followed by severe repressive measures, which in their turn brought a revolutionary group into the open, proclaiming itself the "true government of Poland." Then Polish leaders made categorical demands on Russian authorities adding that they would accept nothing short of

the establishment of a Polish national government. Unfortunately, these demands left the Poles to their own meager resources, for though they could and did expect moral support of their friends abroad, these friends were in no position to aid them in any effective way. Nevertheless, they meant to carry on their resolve.

On January 16, they called the nation to arms, and many Poles serving in the Russian Army responded to this call. Then on the fateful January 22 they announced the emancipation and "complete enfranchisement of every person in the Polish realm without regard to race, religion, or previous condition of bondage."

The response to this announcement was heartening; simultaneous uprisings occurred in many parts of the country, even though the Poles could organize no more than 10,000 men against Russia's 100,000. Therein lay the tragedy of the Polish uprising of 1863. As long as brute force was the arbiter of a righteous and sacred cause, the uprising was doomed to failure. In mid-1864 when the stout-hearted and youthful Polish leader Trautgett was hanged by Russian authorities in Warsaw, the daring Polish uprising against Russia was officially brought to an end. Today, noting the 102d anniversary of the uprising against czarist tyranny, we pay tribute to the memory of those gallant Poles.

Ukrainian Independence: Nationalism at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the last decade has witnessed the emergence of many new nations, some of them barely meeting any valid criteria of nationhood. In fact, many people would argue that these new countries are meddlesome and unstable, and that the world would be a lot better off if the nationalism which spawned them, and which animates their policy, could be forgotten.

Whatever the merits of this contention, there is no doubt that nationalism has played, and can play, a constructive role on the world stage. When genuine national feeling, and a genuine basis for nationhood exists, its suppression is a measureless tragedy. Such has been the unhappy, and yet inspiring fate of the Ukraine, whose brief taste of independence and freedom was crushed by the Soviet Union 47 years ago.

Unhappy—because with all the requisites of nationhood the Ukraine was destroyed. The country possessed a broad and fertile territory; a hardy and intelligent population, and a tradition of independence and democracy going back to medieval times. Its leaders set up a humane and democratic state, with the support of the great majority of their

people. Yet the Red Army snuffed out the life of the Ukrainian Republic, and the Soviets, professing to support self-determination, set up their own regime in the Ukraine.

Inspiring—because Ukrainians have never lost hope. They cannot celebrate January 22 as their national day. Only their brethren living abroad can do so. But oppressed as they are, the people of the Ukraine know, with a sure faith, that a day of freedom will eventually come.

The fate of the Ukraine should also serve as an object lesson to those new countries tempted to play ball with communism, whether of Soviet or Chinese stripe. For communism cannot accept truly valid national aspirations. It can only give them lip service. For the Communists the only nationalism they can support is one which serves their interests. They have proved this in the Ukraine.

The destruction of the Ukrainian Republic can serve as an object lesson for this country as well. It demonstrates that we can never relax our vigilance, never take Soviet professions of cultural or national freedom at face value. But more than this, the example of the Ukrainian people should inspire us all. For if we can only show the same steadfastness, freedom—true freedom—is bound to triumph in the end.

Statue to "Mr. Sam" Unveiled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, our distinguished and able colleague, delivered a timely, brief, but masterful and eloquent address when the statue to our late beloved Speaker was unveiled in the Rayburn Building on January 10. I commend this superb address to the attention of the Congress and to the Nation:

REMARKS OF WRIGHT PATMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AS MASTER OF CEREMONIES AT UNVEILING OF SAM RAYBURN STATUE AT RAYBURN BUILDING, CAPITOL HILL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

President Hutchinson, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered here today to accept reverently and with gratitude a superbly sculptured image in bronze of Sam Rayburn from the Texas State Society of Washington to the American people and their Government. This is the statue of the greatest legislative personality in the history of our country. It is to adorn this massive and distinguished new congressional office building, which is to bear Sam Rayburn's name. The building itself, as you see, in size and scope and capacity to serve, in accommodation, and in its structural soundness and architectural eminence, is a high monument made for the centuries. It is ideally suited to help preserve the name of the great Texan who, by his leadership in the Congress of the United States, has done so much to change for the better the face of our country and the posture of the world.

I knew Sam Rayburn for a half century or more, and I say this building is the ideal monument to his memory, and this statue is a remarkable rendering of the dynamic, the patriotic, the humanely concerned American whom we are here to honor. A building with this immense space and footage is, of course, not a minor undertaking. Much has been said about its cost that, I find, conflicts with the simple truths of arithmetic. In terms of cost—\$86,400,000 in relation to its 33,600,000 cubic feet—this new Rayburn House Office Building may be said to be, not an extravagance, but a sound buy and a solid success from every aspect of fiduciary commonsense.

In truth and in fact, it may be described as a bargain of the first magnitude, except by those who think in the dismal financial language of the 1930's and in the depressed labor market of the same period, the economic evils Sam Rayburn did so much to redress. For example, the Supreme Court at current prices would cost \$4.46 a cubic foot. The Old Senate Office Building would come to \$3.50 at today's prices. Yet this magnificently imposing, ably engineered, brilliantly architected monument in stone and marble cost \$2.46. On the square foot basis, the Supreme Court would cost \$90.94, the Old Senate Office Building \$59.00, and this new Rayburn Building \$36.56. This is arithmetic, not rhetoric. It is the sort of Government deal that would have pleased the heart of "Mr. Sam."

The new Rayburn House Office Building, like the grand old man after whom it is named, looks not only to the present but even more notably to the future. In an age of quick obsolescence, this edifice is made, like Rayburn's toughly achieved reputation, to last for the next thousand years and more. I hope you will forgive my emotion, but Sam Rayburn was my friend, and I revered and loved him as one respects and admires a legendary figure in his lifetime and after.

This statue moves my heart because the Texas State Society of Washington has done a noble thing. For this statue is the ideal tribute in perfect taste and I salute you for it. I know it does all of us good—those who worked so closely and so loyally with the master legislator who has been Speaker of the House longer than any Speaker in history and those who were for years his intimate friends: Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts; the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the House; the sculptor, Felix de Weldon, who so perfectly caught the essence of Mr. Sam's personality; President Everett Hutchinson; and the judges and representatives of the Texas State Society Committee who were commissioned to decide on a fitting memorial. There is, of course, a special and a very particular place in all this for Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. For it must be said it was nothing less than a stroke of genius that named her to make the dedication. And now it must be said that, more than ever before, from here on out with the unweaving of this statue, Speaker Sam Rayburn belongs not only to Texas, but to all our people, indeed, to mankind and to history.

Senator Mansfield Unfairly Criticized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed by a recent editorial

criticizing the distinguished majority leader of the U.S. Senate for expressing his opposition to the closing of veterans hospitals throughout the country. The editorial stated that the current practice of caring for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities is a "fantastic distortion" of the main purpose of caring for sick and disabled veterans of this Nation. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the editorial writer is in error. The system of caring for non-service-connected veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals on a bed-available basis is one which was authorized approximately 40 years ago. It should be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that these individuals suffering from non-service-connected illnesses are in many instances veterans having chronic disabilities, many suffering from neuropsychiatric disorders, others with tuberculosis, and by far the greatest percentage of admissions of this type of patient are receiving a pension and that in itself indicates that they cannot afford to pay for medical care.

These sick individuals must be cared for, and I am not aware that any city, county, or State has come forth with any offer to assume the responsibility for caring for these individuals. I for one feel that they deserve to be treated better than as charity cases.

The editorial writers too conveniently overlooked the contribution which the Veterans' Administration medical system has made to the training of physicians. I cite the recent statement of Dr. John L. Parks, dean of the School of Medicine of George Washington University, and a member of the Executive Council of the Association of American Medical Colleges, when he stated:

A total of 3,885 out of 7,321 registered senior medical students have a part of their fourth year clinical training in VA hospitals. Approximately 10 percent of all residencies are in VA hospitals. Many of America's best specialty training programs have developed through combined university and affiliated VA hospital programs; 15 percent of all practicing physicians have received part or all of their specialty training in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Anyone who takes the trouble to ascertain the facts will learn that excellent medical care is being given in small communities throughout the United States. If this is not the case, why are medical associations, public health groups, and hospital association encouraging the use of Hill-Burton funds to construct, man and maintain hospitals in small communities? This fact in no way detracts from the outstanding research or the quality of medical care which is being performed in hospitals affiliated with medical schools or in medical facilities devoted to research.

Rather than criticize Senator MANSFIELD, the editorial writers should be appreciative of his efforts to bring out one of the facts involved in this complicated situation, and particularly for coming to the defense of a medical system which has made a unique and distinct contribution to medical care in the United States.

I am of the opinion that the editorial criticizing Senator MANSFIELD, which appeared in a local Washington newspaper yesterday, was particularly unfair and,

in fact, missed the entire point of Senator MANSFIELD's position. The editorial accepted the Veterans' Administration hospital closing as a justified economy move and inferred that Senator MANSFIELD's opposition is based on his own local interests. I think this is most unfair. Senator MANSFIELD's question of the Veterans' Administration hospital curtailment has not been on the narrow issue of a hospital in his own State, but rather he has questioned the policies of the Veterans' Administration in closing hospitals in smaller towns and concentrating its medical facilities in the big cities, in many instances hundreds of miles away from the veteran beneficiary.

This editorial characterized the facilities being closed as "old, expensive to maintain, and not needed." This characterization is in direct conflict with the Veterans' Administration's own description of the facility at Miles City, Mont., which is as follows:

The reservation consists of approximately 14 acres and the hospital includes nine brick buildings. It is equipped with the most modern facilities and services for the treatment of medical and surgical patients. There is a new, modern medical library. The staff includes consultants who are outstanding in their specialties. There are approximately 130 full-time employees, comprising a complete team of physicians, dentists, nurses, and a full range of auxiliary staff.

It is a fact that the Miles City Hospital is operated more economically than the local Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration hospital. In December 1964, the per diem cost per patient at Miles City was \$37.62 as compared with a per diem cost per patient at the Washington hospital of \$49.65.

Economy is not the essential issue involved in these closings. Actually, this decision will save only about \$20 million and in fiscal year 1966 the Veterans' Administration will spend for veterans' medical care \$60 million more than it did in the previous year. Their recently announced budget includes \$50 million for new medical facilities. These are mainly located in large population centers. We heard no criticism or cries of economy several years ago when Congress appropriated funds to expand the Washington VA hospital from 335 beds to 760 beds at a cost of \$18,500,000. As I recall, this move was applauded by the local newspapers. The New York City newspaper which has chosen to criticize Senator MANSFIELD's position has failed to note that this year's Federal budget provides \$15,109,000 to build a new hospital at Northport, N.Y., and another million dollars to obtain the site for a hospital to be located on Long Island with a total cost of approximately \$20 million. In other words, the new construction designated for the New York City area will require considerably more funds than will be saved by closing facilities in other parts of the country. I do not criticize the plans of the Veterans' Administration to expand facilities in the New York City area and, in fact, I think they are needed but, again, I must question the excessive emphasis on facilities in large metropolitan areas at the expense of other sections of the country.

At a time when we are being told that the Nation is woefully short of hospital beds and is doing an inadequate job of caring for our older citizens, we are also closing 6,000 VA hospital and domiciliary beds which would cost in excess of \$125 million to replace. This is being done on the basis of economy. At the same time, VA facilities are being expanded in the larger cities, apparently at the expense of veterans located in small towns and rural areas. This is the policy being questioned by Senator MANSFIELD.

It is most unfortunate that newspapers should level criticism at Senator MANSFIELD when he calls for further inquiry into this complicated situation. There are many of us who share his concern about the overemphasis on facilities in large cities at the expense of rural areas. Along with others, I worked hard to secure the authorization of the new Washington VA hospital. I did this because I believed it was needed and justified. But I regret to see the local Washington press criticizing Senator MANSFIELD because he seeks to preserve medical facilities which exist in some less populated areas in order that the veterans in those areas may participate to some degree in the programs our Nation maintains for their benefit.

One-hundredth Anniversary of the Salvation Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, many times throughout the years we have gone on record with our recognition of the Salvation Army's humanitarian work in various disasters, situations of depression, in wartime and in peacetime, at the Christmas season and other seasons, all months and all hours. Today I propose that we place on record a happy acknowledgement of the fact that this year the Salvation Army is 100 years old—that we express our appreciation for this century of service to God and man.

The history of the program aptly described as "heart-to-God, hand-to-man" is reflected directly and indirectly in the lives of people throughout our 50 States—to say nothing of the rest of the world. The dedication of the men and women who fight on all fronts of human need has earned for the Salvation Army not only our respect but our affection.

This centennial makes us think how long the Salvation Army has been feeding the hungry, sheltering the homeless, caring for the sick, helping all manner of the unfortunate, spreading its message of good will, and planting seeds of hope. Even more important, the worldwide observance of the centennial makes us stop to think how much the Salvation Army has grown. All the lines of its service are now woven like strong threads into

the patterns of our social service. And seeing all the Salvation Army hospitals, maternity homes, shelters, schools, missions, camps, institutes for the blind, residences for the elderly—a fantastic number of institutions as well as of services beyond measure—we marvel at the century of progress, the century of service, since it started in England in 1865.

A dedicated minister, William Booth, a nonconformist in that Victorian era of conformity, courageously went to preach the Gospel among the poverty-stricken in the East London slum. He preached on the corners of the streets because the people were in the streets, for this was one of the worst sections of the city during one of its worst periods of economic depression. Full of drunkenness, prostitution, degradation, it was beset by the general evil and specific crime that are born of poverty wed to hopelessness.

Booth had not meant to found a separate church. But his converts, destitute and shabby, were not at home in the regular churches to which he tried to send them. So he banded them together.

Seeing the tragedy, the suffering of the men and women who were out of work, out of health, out of homes, out of hope itself, he was filled with compassion. He and his little group of followers strove to find shelters for the homeless, including children who had nowhere to go, to feed the hungry, care for the sick, and to help the alcoholics.

And this program of spiritual and material help was to be symbolized in the S on the Salvation Army uniforms today. On the collar there are two S's. One S stands for salvation, which is what William Booth was preaching. The other stands for service, which is what he was practicing.

Word of his work spread. The Salvation Army spread. To other parts of England. To Sweden. To the European mainland. It invaded the United States in 1880—from which time until this the history of the services it implemented, year after year, has paralleled much of the history of social progress in this country.

Today in 71 countries and geographical areas the Salvation Army's flag flies over everything from schools to leprosaria, from maternity homes to camps for the elderly. Its spiritual and social welfare ministry attracts people from all walks of life, all income groups, and the diversification of its program is matched only by the multiple needs of troubled humanity. We are familiar with the heart-warming sight of its mobile units, of the men and women who rush in with supplies in times of disaster. We know how they serve snacks or hot beverages to victims and workers in train wrecks, hurricanes, floods, earthquakes.

It would not be Christmas without their red kettles. But even the Army's most loyal supporters are not fully aware of the vast scope of the year-around activities whereby it helps people in need, at their point of need—whatever the need may be.

The Salvation Army, for example, operates 31 general hospitals throughout the world. It cares for frightened un-

wed or deserted mothers in 37 maternity homes and hospitals in the United States. It maintains 125 social service centers in this country where homeless men can reclaim their lives.

Each year the missing persons bureau of the Salvation Army acts as a worldwide network of hope for an average of 12,000 people seeking lost relatives or friends, while its League of Mercy takes comfort and cheer to 3 million lonely, sick, and unfortunate men and women in prisons, hospitals, and other institutions away from the mainstream of life. The Army maintains Evangeline residences where young women can have pleasant, low-cost accommodations. It operates Red Shield Clubs and USO Clubs where men and women of the Armed Forces can find a welcome, attend classes, enjoy athletic and other events. And travelers and immigrants are helped by the Salvation Army's Transportation and Immigration Bureaus.

Poster homes for children of broken homes—day care for children—clubs for boys and girls—camps for senior citizens—and many other allied services are among those provided by the Salvation Army. And—around the world—one of the world's greatest contributions to literacy. The Salvation Army has an amazing number of schools, 857 in fact. It staffs and operates some of them in undeveloped areas where villages are so far apart pupils could not travel to and from class, so they are also given room and board.

In parts of the world so remote that no other aid would be available to the afflicted from the time of their birth to that of their death, the Salvation Army has 10 institutes for the blind. It accommodates 1,301 sufferers from leprosy in well-equipped leprosaria in Malaya, India, Rhodesia, and Sumatra.

The unique army that was begun by William Booth in that London slum section is now one of the nongovernmental organizations of the United Nations. The ministry that he began is now conducted in 147 languages.

The Salvation Army, then, has much for which to be congratulated on this, its 100th anniversary. To its 25,000 officers and cadets, its million members, its 30,000 employees, and the countless citizens who support and serve with them in communities everywhere, let us say "happy birthday." And, humbly, let us all say it with gratitude. It is a remarkable century of service to God and man.

Taxes on Antitrust Treble Damage Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include my statement submitted

to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, January 21, 1965, in opposition to the tax ruling allowing deduction of treble damage antitrust penalties. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER

I welcome the decision of the distinguished chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to consider the recent ruling of the Internal Revenue Service, announced in TIR-615, permitting Federal income tax deductions, as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses, of payments made in satisfaction of, and for unsuccessful defense against, private treble damage claims under the antitrust laws. I am grateful for this opportunity to express my concern at the impact of this ruling upon effective antitrust enforcement.

The antitrust laws embody policies essential to our political and economic strength, and their enforcement is a matter of primary importance. The Sherman Act of 1890, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1-17, is the keystone, so to speak, of the antitrust arch. As the Supreme Court recently stated in *Northern Pacific Ry. v. United States*, 356 U.S. 1, 4:

"The Sherman Act was designed to be a comprehensive charter of economic liberty aimed at preserving free and unfettered competition as the rule of trade. It rests on the premise that the unrestrained interaction of competitive forces will yield the best allocation of our economic resources, the lowest prices, the highest quality and the greatest material progress, while at the same time providing an environment conducive to the preservation of our democratic political and social institutions."

In sweeping language "comparable to that found to be desirable in constitutional provisions" (*Appalachian Coals, Inc. v. United States*, 288 U.S. 344, 359), the Sherman Act condemns contracts, conspiracies and trusts in restraint of trade, and monopolies or conspiracies to monopolize. Violations may be punished both by criminal prosecution and by private actions for treble damages, and either the Government or private parties may sue to restrain violations.

The Clayton Act of 1914, 15 U.S.C. 12-27, supplements the broad provisions of the Sherman Act by prohibiting specified transactions or conduct such as tie-in sales, exclusive dealing, interlocking directorates, mergers and the like where their effect "may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly." Violations may be restrained by injunction at the suit of the Government or a private party, the Government can recover its actual damages incurred as a result of antitrust violations, and private parties are again accorded a right of action for treble damages.

The Internal Revenue Service ruling in TIR-615 must be measured against the public policy embodied in these statutes. I believe that TIR-615 is bad law, bad public policy, and bad public administration. It permits an antitrust offender, already convicted of a criminal antitrust violation, to deduct treble damages paid to its victims after guilt has been established, and consequent damage to the victims proved in a private action.

The legal question before this committee, in my view, is whether conduct which constitutes a criminal antitrust violation is conduct that is "ordinary and necessary" * * * in carrying on any trade or business" within the meaning of the statute, 26 U.S.C. 162, so that the treble damages which Congress has prescribed to punish violators and deter others from violating the antitrust laws, would give rise to an income tax deduction.

From this standpoint of public policy, the question before this committee, as I see it,

is whether the "sting" of treble damages which Congress has prescribed to penalize antitrust violators should be lessened by shifting from the shoulders of criminal antitrust offenders to the taxpayers generally approximately one-half of treble damage awards.

From the standpoint of public administration, the question is whether the Internal Revenue Service by an administrative ruling, not subject to judicial review, should, in effect, amend the antitrust laws by mitigating the treble damages which Congress has expressly prescribed as a "penalty."

To me, the answer to each of these questions is clear from repeated decisions of the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts and from the legislative history of the treble damage provisions of the antitrust laws.

I. THE EXPENSE OF ILLEGAL BUSINESS ACTIVITY IS NOT DEDUCTIBLE AS AN "ORDINARY AND NECESSARY" BUSINESS EXPENSE

When it was first suggested that a Federal income tax deduction should be allowed for the expense of carrying on illegal business activities, Mr. Justice Holmes rejoined, "It will be time enough to consider the question when a taxpayer has the temerity to raise it." *United States v. Sullivan*, 274 U.S. 259, 264.

Accordingly, it is now well settled that fines or penalties paid for violations of State or Federal laws are not deductible under section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code. In *Tank Truck Rentals v. Commissioner*, 356 U.S. 30, and *Hoover Motor Express Co. v. U.S.*, 356 U.S. 38, the Supreme Court held that fines paid for violations of State laws, whether willful or inadvertent, were not deductible as "ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred * * * in carrying on any trade or business." By contrast, TIR-615 confers a Federal income tax deduction on penal damages flowing out of a hard core criminal price-fixing conspiracy in flagrant violation of the Federal antitrust laws.

In *Tank Truck Rentals*, the Supreme Court said (356 U.S. 33-34), 35, 35-6:

"A finding of 'necessity' cannot be made, however, if allowance of the deduction would frustrate sharply defined national or State policies proscribing particular types of conduct, evidenced by some governmental declaration thereof."

"We will not presume that the Congress, in allowing deductions for income tax purposes, intended to encourage a business enterprise to violate the declared policy of a State. To allow the deduction sought here would be to encourage continued violations of State law by increasing the odds in favor of noncompliance. * * *

"Although each case must turn on its own facts, *Jerry Rossman Corp. v. Commissioner*, 175 F. 2d 711, 713, the test of nondeductibility always is the severity and immediacy of the frustration resulting from allowance of the deduction. The flexibility of such a standard is necessary if we are to accommodate both the congressional intent to tax only net income, and the presumption against congressional intent to encourage violation of declared public policy.

"Deduction of fines and penalties uniformly has been held to frustrate State policy in severe and direct fashion by reducing the 'sting' of the penalty prescribed by the State legislature."

Here, as in *Tank Truck Rentals*, supra, this Committee faces the necessity "to accommodate both the congressional intent to tax only net income, and the presumption against congressional intent to encourage violation of declared public policy." Here, as there, "allowance of the deduction would frustrate sharply defined national * * * policies proscribing particular types of conduct." Here,

as there, it would be inappropriate in the absence of a scintilla of evidence to "presume that the Congress, in allowing deductions for income tax purposes intended to encourage a business enterprise to violate the declared policy" embodied in the Federal antitrust laws.

Earlier, in *Textile Mills Corp. v. Commissioner*, 314 U.S. 3266, the Supreme Court upheld a Treasury Regulation denying a deduction for lobbying and propaganda expenses. The Court pointed out that "Contracts to spread such insidious influences through legislative halls have long been condemned" and concluded, "There is no reason why, in the absence of clear congressional action to the contrary, the rule-making authority cannot employ that general policy in drawing a line between legitimate business expenses and those arising from that family of contracts to which the law has given no sanction."

By contrast here, it is difficult to see why the same "rulemaking authority" failed to "employ that general policy [of fostering effective antitrust enforcement] in drawing a line between legitimate business expenses and those arising from that family of contracts to which the law has given no sanction" and indeed roundly condemns.

II. THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY CLEARLY SHOWS THAT CONGRESS REGARDED TREBLE DAMAGES AS PENAL

The legislative history of the treble damage provisions of the antitrust laws clearly shows that the Congress regarded them as penal in nature.¹ *Haskell v. Perkins*, 28 F. 2d 222 (D.N.J., 1928) squarely so holds.

The treble damage provision of the antitrust laws was originally embodied in section 7 of the Sherman Act of July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 210) which provided: "Any person who shall be injured in his business or property by any other person or corporation by reason of anything forbidden or declared to be unlawful by this act, may sue therefor in any circuit court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee."

In the Clayton Act of October 15, 1914, Congress enacted section 4 in its present form (38 Stat. 731), providing for treble damage recoveries for injuries sustained "by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws."

In 1955, Public Law 137 repealed section 7 of the Sherman Act because, as stated in Senate Report No. 619, 84th Congress, 1st session: "Section 7 is almost identical with

¹ Congress has rarely authorized private treble damage actions. Section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 15, is one of but three statutes which provide for mandatory treble damages. The others are the Antidumping Act, 15 U.S.C. 72, and the statute relating to Government-aided railroads which renders the Union Pacific Railroad liable for treble damages to victims of discrimination practiced by the railroad, 45 U.S.C. 83.

The patent and copyright laws permit, but do not require, recoveries up to three times actual damages in cases of infringement, 35 U.S.C. 284, 17 U.S.C. 1, 101, while under 38 U.S.C. 1822, a veteran can recover three times the excess of the purchase price over the reasonable value of property sold under a loan guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, underscoring the importance attached by the Veterans Administration.

The rarity of mandatory treble damages underscores the importance attached by the Congress to effective antitrust enforcement.

section 4 of the Clayton Act, but relates only to violations of the Sherman Act. * * * Since the Clayton Act's section 4 is more comprehensive, section 7 of the Sherman Act is considered to be no longer necessary."

Accordingly, in determining the congressional intent in prescribing treble damages for antitrust violations, the legislative history of original section 7 of the Sherman Act is crucial.

In *Haskell v. Perkins*, *supra*, 28 F. 2d 222, the Court squarely held that the legislative history of section 7 shows that treble damages are penal in nature. There, after the plaintiff had recovered a verdict under the Sherman Act, the defendant died. Accordingly, on the plaintiff's motion to treble the damages and for a counsel fee, the Court confronted the question whether the statutory right to treble damages and counsel fees survived the defendant's death. With eminent counsel on both sides, the Court noted (28 F. 2d 222-3) that "there was, apparently, virtual agreement between counsel in the proposition that, if the matters in dispute were in truth of a punitive nature they could not be considered as having survived [the defendant's] lifetime." In language so apposite that I quote it here at length, the Court concluded (28 F. 2d 223):

"The trebling of the damages and the addition of an attorney's fee can be regarded in no other way than as a burden laid upon an alleged wrongdoer by way of penalty or punishment.

"The records of the introduction and passage of this act have been made available, and it is interesting, in connection with this dispute, to pursue the account of proceedings in the Senate and House at the time the Sherman Act, so called, was made law. Apparently an argument was precipitated through an effort made by a Senator from Texas, who offered an amendment to provide that under this section suit might be brought, not only in the Federal courts, but alternatively in any State court, and during the course of the debate which ensued Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, who was in charge of the bill, and who probably was in large measure the author of the same in its final form, spoke as follows, regarding this very section 7:

"What I wish to point out to the Senate and to the Senator from Texas is this: This section, which is proposed to be amended, is a section establishing a penalty, threefold damages. Now, you cannot clothe a State court with the authority to enforce a penalty. If we create a legal right like a debt by a U.S. statute, then undoubtedly a State court of general jurisdiction, which has authority to enforce and aid in the collection of debts, without express enactment by the Congress of the United States, would sustain an action to recover that debt.

"But, when you come to penalties, no court enforces penalties except those created by the authority which creates the court, and no statute of any foreign or other authority but that can clothe the court with that power. * * * We might perhaps say that a person who owed to another a sum of money under an obligation solely the creature of a statute of the United States might recover in any State court; and if the obligation were created he could recover it equally, whether he said so or not; but we cannot say that a State court shall be clothed with jurisdiction to enforce a claim for threefold damages suffered, which is purely penal and punitive."

"And at that point Mr. Morgan, Senator from Alabama, asked the following question: 'And the attorney's fee?' To which Mr. Hoar replied: 'Yes; and the attorney's fee. So I submit to my honorable friend from Texas

that his amendment, though intended in the same direction as the bill is intended, will not bear examination.'

"There is much of the same nature in the further consideration of this law as set forth in the congressional proceedings, and from it there is no other conclusion to be drawn than that Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, Senator Morgan, of Alabama, and Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, all of them eminent lawyers, regarded the trebling of damages and the attorney's fee as constituting a penalty."

Accordingly, the legislative history seems crystal clear that the Congress conceived of treble damages for violation of the antitrust laws as penal in nature.

The final judgment in *Haskell v. Perkins* was later reversed on other grounds, *id.*, 2d Cir., 31 F. 2d 53, cert. den. 279 U.S. 827, but the holding that treble damages are penal in nature has been widely cited and followed.

Thus in *Sun Theatre Corp. v. RKO Radio Pictures* (7th Cir., 213 F. 2d 284), the court referred to the legislative history I have just canvassed and concluded (p. 287): "the only permissible interpretation is that the remedy afforded is treble damages, penal in nature."

Again, in *Rogers v. Douglas Tobacco Board of Trade*, 5th Cir., 244 F. 2d 471, the court cited *Haskell v. Perkins*, *supra*, and held (p. 483): "Trebling of the damages seems to us to be in the nature of a penalty for the public wrong."

Finally, in *Leh v. General Petroleum Corp.*, 9th Cir., 330 F. 2d 288, the court in a recent exhaustive opinion written by Judges Barnes, formerly the Assistant Attorney General in Charge of the Antitrust Division, referred to the holding in *Haskell v. Perkins* as "correct."

III. TREBLE DAMAGES UNDER THE ANTITRUST LAWS ARE PENALTIES TO PUNISH THE OFFENDER AND TO DETER OTHERS

In the cases where the proper tax treatment of treble damages under the antitrust laws was directly at issue, the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts consistently have characterized them as "payments * * * extracted from the wrongdoers as punishment for unlawful conduct," *Commissioner v. Glenshaw Glass Co.*, 348 U.S. 426 at p. 431.

Similarly, in *Commissioner of Internal Revenue v. Obeir-Nester Glass Co.*, 7th Cir., 217 F. 2d, the court distinguished sharply between compensatory and "punitive" damages stating (at pp. 61-62): "The principal purpose of treble damages seems to be punishment which will deter the violator and others from future illegal acts."

Indeed, the courts have generally stressed the public purpose in prescribing treble damages under the antitrust laws to punish offenders and to deter others from violating the antitrust laws.

Thus, in *Karseal Corp. v. Richfield Oil Corp.*, 9th Cir., 221 F. 2d 358, the court noted (p. 365): "The treble damage action was intended not merely to redress injury to an individual through the prohibited practices, but to aid in achieving the broad social object of the statute."

Again, in *Kinnear-Weed Corp. v. Humble Oil & Refining Co.*, 5th Cir., 214 F. 2d 891, the court held (p. 893): "The main purpose of those laws was to protect the public from monopolies and restraint of trade, and the private right of action for treble damages was incidental and subordinate to the main purpose. *Glenn Coal Co. v. Dickinson Fuel Co.*, 4th Cir., 72 F. 2d 885, 889. The grant of a claim for treble damages to persons injured was for the purpose of multiplying the agencies which would help enforce the antitrust laws and therefore make them more effective. *Maltz v. Sax*, 7th Cir., 134 F. 2d 2, 4. The very foundation of the right of a private suitor to recover 'threefold the damages by

him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee' is the violation of public rights prohibited by the act, and, indeed, made criminal offenses. 15 U.S.C.A. secs. 1, 2."

Finally, in *Lyons v. Westinghouse Electric Corp.*, 2d Cir., 222 F. 2d 184, cert. den. 350 U.S. 825, Judge Learned Hand described a private treble damage action under the antitrust laws thus: "The remedy provided is not solely civil; two-thirds of the recovery is not remedial and inevitably presupposes a punitive purpose. It is like a qui tam action except that the plaintiff keeps all the penalty, instead of sharing it with the sovereign."

IV. PAYMENT OF FINES AND PENALTIES AND FOR THE UNSUCCESSFUL DEFENSE OF CASES UNDER THE ANTITRUST LAWS ARE NOT DEDUCTIBLE

Accordingly, the courts have generally denied Federal income tax deductions for payments of statutory penalties to the State and Federal Governments and for counsel fees incurred in the unsuccessful defense of antitrust proceedings brought by the State and Federal Governments.

In *Commissioner of Internal Revenue v. Longhorn Portland Cement Co.*, 5 Cir., 148 F. 2d 276, the Court denied a deduction for payments made to the State of Texas in compromise of a suit under the State antitrust laws to recover statutory penalties. In so doing, the Court reversed the tax court which had found that the defendants "didn't admit their guilt and were not proven guilty, and that the compromise settlement was made by them because they believed a defense of the suit would be more expensive than the settlement even if the verdict was favorable." (148 F. 2d 277). Overturning the tax court's decision that such compromise payments were not penal in nature and hence were deductible, the court said (148 F. 2d 277-278):

"The sense of the rule that statutory penalties are not deductible from gross income is that the penalty is a punishment inflicted by the State upon those who commit acts violative of the fixed public policy of the sovereign, wherefore to permit the violator to gain a tax advantage through deducting the amount of the penalty as a business expense, and thus to mitigate the degree of his punishment, would frustrate the purpose and effectiveness of that public policy.

"The test universally employed to determine the applicability of the doctrine to any such claimed deduction is whether the sums claimed were paid as penalties * * * if deduction for such expense is to be denied, it must be because allowance would frustrate sharply defined public policies.

"Though the solution of such issues usually turns upon the taxpayer's guilt or innocence of a crime, the ultimate determinative inquiry upon this appeal is whether the deduction claimed was paid as a penalty. This is illustrated by cases where due to a compromise settlement, the question of guilt or innocence was not established, yet the deduction claimed was disallowed to the extent that it represented a payment made to extinguish a cause of action to impose a penalty."

Such also was the holding in *Burroughs Building Material Co. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 2 Cir., 47 F. 2d 178, where the court disallowed a deduction for fines, costs and counsel fees incurred in an unsuccessful defense of a suit against a corporation and its president under the New York State antitrust law. Again, in *Gould Paper Co. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 2 Cir., 72 F. 2d 698, 699, 702, the Court denied an income tax deduction for counsel fees paid in connection with the unsuccessful defense of a criminal action and a

suit in equity under the antitrust laws. Moreover, in *National Outdoor Advertising Bureau v. Helvering*, 2 Cir., 89 F. 2d 878, the Court held that the taxpayer could not deduct his legal expenses incident to the defense of an antitrust action brought by the Federal Government which was settled in the course of trial by a consent decree declaring unlawful a contract to which the taxpayer was a party although the decree did not find that the taxpayer had committed the offense forbidden by the consent decree. The Court concluded (89 F. 2d at p. 881):

"If it is never necessary to violate the law in managing a business, it cannot be necessary to resist a decree in equity forbidding violations, except in cases where an injunction is unjustified. There is indeed less to be said for spending money in that way than in defending a criminal prosecution, for the decree by hypothesis will do no more than forbid what the taxpayer ought not to do anyway."

V. CONGRESS HAS RECENTLY AGAIN MANIFESTED ITS INTENT TO PUNISH ANTITRUST VIOLATORS BY INCREASING THE MAXIMUM FINES FOR CRIMINAL VIOLATION OF THE SHERMAN ACT

Congress has recently again manifested its intent to deal severely with criminal antitrust offenders, particularly giant business corporations which engage in restraints of trade.

As enacted in 1890 the Sherman Act provided criminal penalties not to exceed \$5,000 or 1 year in prison or both. Since corporations could not be sentenced to imprisonment and prison sentences for corporate officers were rare, criminal sanctions for huge nationwide corporations amounted to a mere slap on the wrist.

The inadequacy of the financial sanctions against large corporations, such as those involved in the notorious electrical equipment conspiracies, was a matter of continuing congressional and legislative concern. Accordingly, in 1955, the Congress amend the Sherman Act to increase the penalties for each violation from \$5,000 to \$50,000 (Public Law 135, 84th Cong., 1st sess., 69 Stat. 282).

As the Senate report on that bill noted, "As early as 1900 a House committee reported that the penalty provisions were deemed insufficient,"² and a similar position was taken in the minority views of Representatives Nelson and Volstead in connection with the House bill which ultimately became the Clayton Act.³

In *U.S. v. South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n.*, 322 U.S. 533, 591 at note 11, Mr. Justice Jackson observed:

"The antitrust law sanctions are little better than absurd when applied to huge corporations engaged in great enterprise. In the two related Madison Oil cases (see *United States v. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.*, 310 U.S. 150) 15 of the 17 corporations convicted had combined capital and surplus reported to be \$2,833,516,247. The total corporate fines on them were \$255,000 making a ratio of fines to corporate capital and surplus of less than one-hundredth of 1 percent. In addition, fines of \$180,000 were assessed against individuals. In the automobile financing case (see *United States v. General Motors Corp.*, 121 F. 2d 376, cert. denied, 314 U.S. 618)

General Motors Corp., three wholly owned subsidiaries and no individuals were convicted. The fines were \$20,000. Capital and surplus were then reported at \$1,047,840,321, the fine being somewhat less than one five-hundredths of 1 percent thereof."

The very reason which moved the Congress to increase the penalties for each violation of the Sherman Act from \$5,000 to \$50,000 was stated in the Senate report to be: "so small a fine may indicate that the offense for which it was levied is not very serious, with the result that some businessmen may consider the possibility of violation a good business risk."

This attitude—that a violation of our antitrust laws, even a flagrant criminal price fixing conspiracy, is no worse than a traffic ticket—is the major premise of TIR-615. Such an attitude is indefensible. It conflicts with the intent of Congress expressed in the antitrust laws. It is also at war with the more recent recognition of Congress that increased criminal penalties were needed if the sanctions of the antitrust laws are to be truly effective.

VI. TIR-615 MISTAKENLY RESTS ON A MINORITY VIEW IN CONTENDING THAT TREBLE DAMAGES ARE "REMEDIAL" RATHER THAN PENAL

I understand that the Internal Revenue Service relies on a line of cases following *City of Atlanta v. Chattanooga Foundry and Pipe Works*, 203 U.S. 390, for the proposition that private treble damage actions under the antitrust laws are "remedial" rather than "penal" in nature. The Chattanooga case and those which have followed it involve the question of the appropriate State statute of limitations governing such actions.

To the extent that those cases, which arose before the amendment of the Clayton Act in 1955 to provide a uniform statute of limitations for actions arising under the antitrust laws, 15 U.S.C. 15b, applied a State statute of limitations other than the statute applicable to actions to recover on a penalty, they recognize the public policy embodied in section 4 of the Clayton Act which favors private enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Moreover, even if the statute of limitations cases were relevant here, they are inconclusive. As the court noted in *Englander Motors, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co.*, 6 Cir., 293 F. 2d 802, 804, the Federal courts have been divided on the question whether private treble damage actions under the antitrust laws are "penal" or "remedial" for purposes of the statute of limitations.

However, the most recent decision on this issue holds that a private treble damage action is penal in nature. *Leh v. General Petroleum Corp.*, *supra*, 330 F. 2d 288. The comprehensive opinion in the Leh case, as I have already noted, was written by Judge Barnes, a former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

Citing the report of the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws (p. 379) to the effect that the treble damage provision penalizes antitrust violators by "imposing the harsh penalty of multiple damages," Judge Barnes concluded (330 F. 2d 298-299): "What is recovered under section 7 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 15 note) is no less a penalty on the wrongdoer than is the fine or imprisonment with which the sovereign can threaten the violator under sections 1 and 2, or the forfeiture of articles transported in commerce, as provided for in section 6 (15 U.S.C. 6)."

The same "policy of the Federal statute," namely, to encourage effective private antitrust enforcement, applies with equal force to cases such as *Rogers v. Douglas Tobacco Board of Trade*, *supra*, 244 F. 2d 471, 483, which deal with the nature of the treble damage remedy in connection with questions of abatement and survival. *Cinnamon v. Ab-*

ner A. Wolf, Inc., 215 F. Supp. 833 (D. Mich., 1963).

In view of this paramount public policy, the answer to the proper tax treatment of treble damages, it seems to me, is suggested by these words of Judge Cardozo in *Cox v. Lykes Bros.*, 237 N.Y. 376; 143 N.E. 226 at pp. 227-228: "We are to remember that the same provision may be penal as to the offender and remedial as to the sufferer. * * * The nature of the problem will determine whether we are to take one viewpoint or the other."

Applying this test to the proper tax treatment of treble damages, treble damages are properly taxable as income to a successful antitrust plaintiff. So the courts have held in *Commissioner v. Glenshaw Glass Co.* (348 U.S. 426), and *Commissioner of Internal Revenue v. Obeare-Nester Glass Co.* (7 Cir., 217 F. 2d 56). By the same reasoning a deduction should be denied to the unsuccessful defendant in a private treble damage action under the antitrust laws.

VII. THE ERROR OF TIR-615 IS DEMONSTRATED BY THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE FLAGRANT CRIMINAL ANTITRUST CONSPIRACY WHICH IT PREDICATES AND THE LEADING CASES ALLOWING "BUSINESS EXPENSE" DEDUCTIONS

(1) In support of TIR-615, the Internal Revenue Service may also be expected to cite *Commissioner v. Heininger* (320 U.S. 462), where the Supreme Court upheld deduction of legal expenses incurred in connection with an unsuccessful attack upon a mail fraud order. The decisive difference is to be found in the fact, as the Supreme Court noted, that it is not the policy of the statutes which authorize the Postmaster General to issue fraud orders "to impose personal punishment upon violators," 320 U.S. 474. By contrast, as we have seen, it is the purpose of the treble damage provision of the antitrust laws to impose a penalty upon offenders.

In *Jerry Rossman Corporation v. Commissioner*, *supra* (195 F. 2d 711, 713), Judge Learned Hand had this to say of the Heininger case: "It is possible to read it as distinguishing between the legal expenses of an unsuccessful defense and the payment of fines or forfeitures. On the other hand, it is also possible to read it as meaning that, whether the claimed deduction be of legal expenses or of fines or forfeitures, its allowance depends upon the place of sanctions in the scheme of enforcement of the underlying act. We think that the second is the right reading."

I fully concur in this view, and I submit that the difference between the statute authorizing a prophylactic administrative stop order designed to prevent fraudulent advertising through the mails in the Heininger case, and the criminal and penal treble damage sanctions in the antitrust laws demonstrates that by no stretch of imagination does the Heininger case support deduction of penal treble damage payments.

(2) Again, the Internal Revenue Service may be expected to cite *Commissioner v. Sullivan* (356 U.S. 87), where the Supreme Court held deductible payments for rent and salaries in the conduct of illegal gambling enterprises. In sustaining the deduction, the Supreme Court stressed that Congress had recognized the existence of the gambling business by imposing a Federal excise tax on wages and that the regulations of the Internal Revenue Service made this tax deductible as an ordinary and necessary business expense. The Court stated (356 U.S. 28-29): "This seems to us to be recognition of a gambling enterprise as a business for Federal tax purposes. The policy that allows as a deduction the tax paid to conduct the business seems sufficiently hospitable to allow the normal deductions of the rent and wages necessary to operate it."

² Senate Report No. 618, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

³ Minority views of Representatives John M. Nelson and A. J. Volstead, House Report 627, 63d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 3, p. 7: "Attention must be directed, also, to the fact that the maximum fine which is provided * * * is \$5,000. To fine a great trust a maximum of \$5,000 when the loot it gained may have been many hundred times that sum, is most ridiculous. The maximum should be much greater in amount."

By contrast here, the Congress has never countenanced illegal conspiracies in violation of the antitrust laws.

(3) TIR-615 cites *Jerry Rossman v. Commissioner*, supra, 175 F. 2d 711. That case is wholly inapplicable here. There, the defendant voluntarily paid to the Office of Price Administration inadvertent overcharges to his customers; in that case, (a) there was no criminal conviction, (b) the offense was inadvertent, and not deliberate, and (c) the defendant had voluntarily disclosed the offense and done his best to make restitution. This is *toto coelo* different from the criminal conspiracies concealed by the defendants, and punished by conviction when uncovered, which TIR-615 predicates.

(4) Finally, the Internal Revenue Service may cite *Foss v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 1 Cir., 75 F. 2d, 326, where the Court sustained the deduction of payments for counsel fees incurred by the president of a corporation in the unsuccessful defense of a stockholder's derivative suit to enjoin violations of the Sherman Act. The contention may be that the *Foss* case sustains a deduction in private actions under the antitrust laws, whereas payments of fines and penalties on account of antitrust violations to the sovereign are not deductible. This contention was rejected by Judge Learned Hand in *National Outdoor Advertising Bureau v. Helvering*, supra, where he acknowledged the conflict of that decision with the *Foss* case, stating "we cannot see any distinction between the unsuccessful defense of a suit by a minority shareholder to enjoin the unlawful conduct of the taxpayer and a suit brought by the sovereign."

Similarly, in *International Shoe Co.*, 38 BTA 81, 95-97, the Board of Tax Appeals sustained a deduction for attorney's fees and the amounts paid in settlement of a private action under the antitrust laws. The Board reasoned that "There is no evidence that the petitioner and its officers had entered into any conspiracy or committed any illegal act. The petitioner was, however, receiving unfavorable publicity from the suit and its officers considered that it might be advisable to pay a reasonable amount to settle the controversy." However, whatever authority the *International Shoe* case may once have possessed, its rationale was later flatly rejected in *Commissioner of Internal Revenue v. Longhorn Portland Cement Co.*, supra, 148 F. 2d 276-277.

VIII. ANALOGOUS DECISIONS UNDER OTHER STATUTES LIKEWISE HIGHLIGHT THE ERROR EMBODIED IN TIR-615

Since treble damages under the antitrust laws are penal in nature, the decisions of the courts and of the Internal Revenue Service itself under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (50 U.S.C.A. app. 925 (e)) afford no support for TIR-615. Instead, they serve to highlight the error of this ruling, and the same is true of the Tax Court rulings under section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. 78p(b), and cases the *Walsh-Healey Act*, 41 U.S.C. 35 et seq.

(1) As to the OPA cases, as Judge Learned Hand noted in *Jerry Rossman Corporation v. Commissioner*, supra, 175 F. 2d at p. 714, Congress amended the statute to mitigate the treble damage penalty in the case of innocent violations.

Accordingly, it became the rule that a taxpayer could deduct payments to the Office of Price Administration in settlement of charges of price ceiling violations if the taxpayer could establish that the overcharge had been innocently and unintentionally made and not through an unreasonable lack of care, *National Brass Works v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 9 Cir., 182 F. 2d 526. If, on the other hand, the taxpayer

acted purposely, deliberately and knowingly, payments to the Administrator in settlement of such charges were not deductible, *National Brass Works v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 16 T.C. 1051, affirmed 9 Cir., 205 F. 2d 104; *American Brewery v. U.S.*, 126 F. 2d 477 (D.Md. 1954); *Nemrow Bros., Inc. v. U.S.*, 125 F. 2d 604.

By the same token here, since TIR-615 predicates a criminal conspiracy in restraint of trade, these OPA rulings would suggest denial of any deductions.

In support of TIR-615, the Internal Revenue Service cites its own ruling in 1943 C.B. 111, 112-3 to the effect that amounts paid pursuant to judgments in favor of consumers or tenants (other than the United States) in consumer actions under section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and amounts paid in compromise of pending or contemplated litigation in such cases, were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses. This attempted distinction between actions brought by the sovereign and by private parties is at odds with the holding of Judge Learned Hand in *National Outdoor Advertising Bureau v. Helvering*, supra, 89 F. 2d at p. 881, that there is no such distinction.

In any event the Internal Revenue Service ruling permitting a deduction of payments in satisfaction of private suits under the OPA statutes is inapplicable here, for Congress has never relaxed the treble damage penalties—indeed, it has increased the criminal sanctions—for violations of the antitrust laws, whereas, at the behest of the Administrator, Congress mitigated the penalties for violation of the Emergency Price Control Act, *Jerry Rossman Corp. v. Commissioner*, supra, 175 F. 2d at p. 714.

(2) In sharp contrast with TIR-615 are the decisions of the Tax Court and the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service denying deduction for payments by corporate insiders, made by way of restitution for short-swing profits gained in violation of section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Unlike the antitrust laws, violations of section 16(b) are not punishable either criminally or by a private treble damage action. Instead, section 16(b) merely requires the corporate insider to restore profits gained from short-swing trading in his corporation's stock. Nevertheless, the Tax Court and the Internal Revenue Service have consistently ruled that such payments by way of restitution are "in the nature of a penalty" and deduction of such payments have been disallowed because a deduction "would mitigate the deterrent effect of the statute and subvert a sharply defined public policy." *William F. Davis, Jr.*, 17 T.C. 549; *Robert Lehman*, T.C. 629, 635; 1952 C.B. 28.⁴

(3) A further relevant analogy is furnished by *McGraw-Edison Co. v. U.S.*, 300 F. 2d 453 (ct. cls., 1962), a decision written by Mr. Justice Reed, now retired from the Supreme Court. There the Court held that a taxpayer could not deduct as a business expense sums paid in compromise of amounts claimed by the United States under provisions of a Government contract prohibiting the use of child labor in its performance. In language directly applicable here, Mr. Justice Reed said (p. 455): "Deduction of amounts assessed as penalties pursuant to specific legislation virtually always must be treated as frustrating 'sharply defined National or State policies' unless those charged with the administration or interpretation of the statute have indicated that deductibility will not undercut the governmental punitive purpose."

⁴In *Lawrence M. Marks*, 27 T.C. 464, the decision permitted such a deduction only where it was doubtful whether there was any violation at all.

By the same token here, I submit, deduction of treble damages should not be allowed unless "those charged with the administration and interpretation of the statute"—to wit, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice—"have indicated that deductibility will not undercut the governmental punitive purpose." TIR-615 cites no such indication from the Department of Justice. Indeed, I am informed that the Antitrust Division has taken a contrary position.

IX. TIR-615 IS INTERNALLY INCONSISTENT AND IT IS INCONSISTENT WITH EFFECTIVE ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

TIR-615 is internally inconsistent, as previous rulings of the Internal Revenue Service have been inconsistent, with respect to the deductibility of fines, damages and counsel fees incurred in the unsuccessful defense of antitrust actions.

In 1944 C.B. 93, in the wake of the *Heininger* case, supra, the ruling was that legal expenses incurred by a corporation in defending itself and its officers and directors for violation of the Sherman Act were deductible.

However, in 1962—2 C.B. 50, that broad ruling was modified to render nondeductible attorneys' fees and related legal expenses paid or incurred in unsuccessfully defending a prosecution for criminal violation of the Sherman Act.

Now, TIR-615 would deny a deduction for payment of compensatory damages to the Federal Government on account of antitrust violations but would permit a deduction for treble damages which, as we have seen, are penal in nature. This ruling is flatly inconsistent with the announced principle on which it purports to proceed, namely, that if the statutory right is "remedial" a deduction should be allowed, whereas if the statutory remedy is "penal," no deduction should be allowed.

The obvious unstated reason for denying a deduction for damages paid to the Federal Government in an action to recover "actual" damages under section 4A of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 15a, is that the Government would never be fully compensated if the defendant were allowed to deduct from its income tax roughly one-half of the amount of the payment.

However, there is not a scintilla of evidence to suggest that Congress intended by allowing the deduction of "ordinary and necessary business expenses" to reduce the "sting" of the treble damage penalties previously prescribed in the antitrust laws. On the contrary, as we have seen, Congress has recently evidenced its concern that the penalties for antitrust violations may be inadequate rather than the reverse.

Accordingly, and in flat violation of the "cardinal principle" that repeals by implication of the antitrust laws are not favored (*U.S. v. Borden Co.*, 308 U.S. 188, 198; *Georgia v. Pennsylvania R. Co.*, 324 U.S. 439, 456-7; *California v. Federal Power Commission*, 369 U.S. 482, 485; *Silver v. New York Stock Exchange*, 373 U.S. 341, 357), TIR-615 would in effect amend the treble damage provision in section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 15, by reducing the penalties which Congress has prescribed to approximately double damages. I respectfully submit that to work such a *de facto* amendment of the antitrust laws by an administrative ruling, not subject to judicial review, in the teeth of the clearly expressed intent of Congress, and in the face of a long line of judicial decisions to the contrary, is bad law, bad public policy, and bad public administration.

I trust and believe that this distinguished committee will take whatever action may be necessary to correct this serious mistake.